

The Review of English Studies

VOL. I.—NO. I.

JANUARY 1925.

“THE REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES”

IN the preliminary announcement of this Review it was stated that its chief attention would be devoted to research in all departments of its subject. The word “research” is capable of several interpretations, and some amplification of this statement is perhaps desirable.

To the founders of the Review it seems that research as they understand it is the life-blood of literary history; that without it, without the constant discovery of new facts and of new relations between the old, the study can be little more than the reiteration of stale arguments, coloured perhaps by temporary likes and dislikes, by fashion and by prejudice, but still essentially the same; a weary study and one without pleasure or profit either to the teacher or to the taught.

But in matters of literary history “research” is not quite the same thing as in the natural sciences. We have less to do with that which has never previously been known, and more with that which has never been rightly interpreted. There is little for us to discover in the way of bare fact that was not known to some person or other before our day; much of our work must necessarily be *rediscovery*, but it is no less important on that account and no less worthy of the name of research. Much toil might indeed have been saved to us if our forefathers had thought fit to put on record a few of the familiar facts about their great contemporaries, their lives and their writings, which we now labour to infer from a hint or a jest. Had they done this we should have been many stages further on the endless road, but there would still have been need, as much and no

more than there is to-day, for research. For bare facts are not all. Much of what we strive to find out was not and could not be known to those of the period which we study, for it was veiled from them by the life of everyday. They were like travellers in the forest who cannot see the greater conformation of the land for the undergrowth that presses round them too closely on every side. It is our task as researchers to discover not only the facts, the dry minutiae, but the relations between them, their reactions upon one another, those slower changes and developments to which the most clear-sighted of contemporaries must be ever blind. This knowledge, if we can attain it, is new knowledge, and as well deserves the name of discovery as any secret wrested from nature by the astronomer or physicist.

It is in this sense that those who have planned this Review would use the name of research, in the sense of interpretation of material as well as that of amassing it; for though all honour is due to the laborious compiler of fact upon fact, a view of research which ranges no further than this misses in their opinion all that is best in it and most worthy of effort. This Review will therefore welcome new facts—however disconnected and in themselves seemingly unimportant they may be—but it will welcome no less cordially attempts to weave such facts into a larger unity, to interpret them in the light of their own time and of ours, and to place them in their true relation to the knowledge that we already possess. Its pages will be open to all new matter, to all new interpretation of the old; the one kind of article that it is hoped to exclude is the mere compilation which has nothing fresh to say.

* * * * *

But our aim is much more than the mere collection and printing of work already accomplished. English studies have in the past suffered greatly from want of co-ordination. Many of the best researchers have worked in ignorance of what others were doing in the same field, and much time has been wasted by duplication. It is our hope that this Review may serve as a centre for all such workers, that they may report in it what they themselves are doing, seek through its means the aid of others in their difficulties, and by its help be brought into touch with other workers in their own and neighbouring fields.

And then, too, research has suffered much from want of guidance.

This is indeed now excellently supplied in at least one of the great schools of English, but there are still many who have great difficulty in obtaining the instruction that they need. It may be readily admitted that no amount of training will, in any branch of inquiry, make a competent researcher out of a student who has no natural talent in that direction. To those, however, with the requisite endowments it will certainly save much time, and it may save premature discouragement in the important first years of a student's enthusiasm, when he feels that he has energy and life enough to undertake those longer tasks from which the man whose experience has been tediously acquired through many mistakes may well shrink. This Review will therefore not confine itself to the printing and criticism of work done; it will devote an important part of its space to the discussion of methods and to special articles intended to afford such instruction and information as may be useful to young students, and perhaps even to some of the older ones, in this field.

These then are some of the aims of those who have promoted this Review. But its success or failure does not lie in their hands, but in the hands of those who are interested in the study of English literature—in the hands of every one of them. If they will support it, make use of it, demanding from it what they require but bearing with its imperfections, at any rate in its early days, it will, before long, prove of real value for the progress of English studies. If not it will as surely fail.

RECENT RESEARCH UPON THE *ANCREN RIWLE*

BY R. W. CHAMBERS

It is now more than seventy years since the first (and so far the only) edition of the *Ancren Riwe* was made by James Morton. Morton was no philological specialist, and he owns to having been sometimes puzzled (as most later students have been) by obscurities of language. Yet his edition is a solid piece of work. For sixty years, scholarship had little to add to Morton's statements concerning the origin and authorship of the *Rule*, and his view that the book was written by Richard Poore (who was Bishop successively of Chichester, Salisbury and Durham, and who died in 1237) is repeated, with more or less hesitation, in the standard works of reference.*

But ten years ago a new stage in the study of the book was inaugurated by G. C. Macaulay, with his patient collation of the manuscripts; and the present-day student is overwhelmed by a mass of conflicting arguments. Three new claimants to the honour of the authorship have been brought forward, while it has been maintained that the book was not written first in English, but was translated from the Anglo-Norman.

The question of language is one of importance. For the *Rule* is the greatest book of its class in either Anglo-Norman or English. A good deal of it is the ordinary mediæval pious instruction; but from time to time we find the writer showing powers of an astonishing kind. For example, this account of the backbiter is like nothing that we know, up to this date, in either English or Norman prose: it might come from a character-sketch many centuries later:

He casts down his head, and begins to sigh before he says a word; then he talks around the subject for a long time with a sorrowful countenance, to be the better believed. But when it all comes out, it is yellow poison: "Alas, wellaway, woe is me, that he (or she) has fallen into such

* E.g. *Cambridge History of English Literature*, i. 230; *Dictionary of National Biography*.

repute. Enough did I try, but I could do no good herein. It is long ago that I knew of it; but nevertheless it should never have been betrayed by me; but now that it is so widely known through others, I cannot gainsay it. They say that it is bad; and yet it is worse than they say. Grieved and sorry I am that I must say it; but in truth it is so, and that is a great grief. For many other things he (or she) is greatly to be praised; but not for these, and woe is me therefore. No one can defend them."*

A book of devotion, written by a pronounced ascetic, for three ladies, anchoresses, whose way of life was, as the writer says, one perpetual martyrdom, might have proved painful reading. Instead, it is so kindly and gentle, so full of sound common-sense, that although the reading of it is no easy task, the reader looks back on it as one of the most pleasant of mediæval books, and one of the principal ornaments of the literature to which it belongs.

Thirteen manuscripts of the *Rule* are extant, complete or fragmentary: eight in English, four in Latin, and one in French.† There is no doubt whatever that the book was written in England—the fact that the writer thanks God “that heresy prevails not in England” is one sign out of many. In what language it was written has been the subject of dispute from the outset. The work was known to Wanley in the eighteenth century, and he, not unnaturally, took it for granted that the Latin was the original and the English a translation.‡ Morton, when he edited the English version in 1853, argued from the blunders of the Latin text that it could be nothing but a translation, and often a mistranslation, of the English. For forty years this view held the field, till Bramlette § tried to

* Cf. Morton, p. 88.

† *English, Thirteenth Century*: First Recension: Cotton Nero A. xiv. (printed by Morton), Titus D. xviii., Cleopatra C. vi. (with some corrections from second recension), Caius College, Cambridge, 234 (a book of extracts, specimen printed by Hall); Second Recension: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 402 (extracts printed by Heuser in *Anglia*, xxx. 108–10, by Macaulay, and by Hall). *Fourteenth Century*: Vernon Manuscript, and a fragment in the possession of Lord Robartes edited by Napier in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, ii. 199; Pepys, 2498 (Magdalen College, Cambridge) is a Third Recension, discovered by Miss Paues and printed by Pählsson, Lund, 1911.

French: Vitellius F. vii. (damaged; beginning of the Fourteenth Century).

Latin: Cotton Vitellius E. vii. (almost destroyed: early Fourteenth Century); Merton, Oxford, 44 (early Fourteenth Century, reported by Miss Allen, *Modern Language Review*, xiv. 209); Magdalen, Oxford, 67 (late Fourteenth Century); British Museum Royal 7, C. x. art. 4 (early Sixteenth Century, reported by Miss Allen, *Modern Language Review*, xvii. 403).

‡ Wanleii *Catalogus*, 228 (Oxonæ, 1705, in Hicckes' *Thesaurus*). He describes the Nero Manuscript as *ex Latino translatus*.

§ *Anglia*, xv. 478–498.

reassert the priority of the Latin. Here and there Bramlette scores a point against Morton: so that this is one of the numerous controversies where the reader who does not go back to see exactly how much of the original case remains unshaken, may well think that such case has been overthrown. In point of fact, the number of Morton's arguments which remain quite untouched is amply sufficient to prove his case that the Latin is a translation; and were this not so, there remain any number of further arguments in reserve. This was conclusively shown by G. C. Macaulay.*

G. C. Macaulay was the first scholar to make use of the French version of the *Rule*. Morton had been unable to consider its claims, for the French manuscript was so damaged in the great Cottonian fire as to be in his day quite unusable. It has been repaired, and most of it can now be read. Macaulay's study led him to the conclusion that, though the Latin was translated from the English, the English in its turn was translated from the French.

Yet there is one fact which was well known both to Bramlette and to Macaulay, and which makes extremely difficult any theory which denies that the English version is the original one. That G. C. Macaulay should have passed so lightly over the fatal flaw in his argument emphasises the saying of the *Ancren Riwele*, that "often does a full cunning smith forge a full weak knife."

In the English *Ancren Riwele* occur six long lines of rhyming verse.† Now in the corresponding place in the French, and in the Latin, is found a literal translation of these lines into prose. Macaulay proposed to account for these facts by supposing that these lines of verse were not by the author of the *Ancren Riwele*, but were current at the time. "The French writer, who was no doubt an Englishman, turned them into French prose when he adopted them for his purpose . . . the English translator, being familiar with the original, quoted them as verse."

Now a precedent for such treatment of a translated passage *can* be found. When Bede gave his account of the poet Cædmon in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, he gave the text of Cædmon's first song in a Latin prose translation. When, under Alfred, Bede's Latin was translated into English, Bede's paraphrase was not retranslated, but the English text of Cædmon's song was substituted for it. But such action by a mediæval translator in dealing with the

* *Modern Language Review*, ix. 70-78.

† Morton, p. 240.

quotations in his original shows extraordinary information and mental alertness. It would be remarkable if a twelfth-century writer, using French, had woven into his discourse a literal translation of a piece of English verse, and if his English translator had been able from memory to reinsert the English original.

But what Mr. Macaulay supposes to have happened is something much more complicated than this, for which I do not think any precedent can be found. For these verses are not given, either in the French or the English, as the current quotation which Mr. Macaulay assumes them to be. What is given as a current quotation is a Latin distich enumerating the subjects of holy meditation :

Mors tua, mors Domini, nota culpæ, gaudia celi,
Iudicii terror, figantur mente fideli.

Then follow in the English the words "That is," and then the six lines of English verse : this six-line English poem is a paraphrase of the Latin distich, expanding it *metri gratia* and putting the subjects of meditation in a different order, to facilitate the rhyme. The French gives the Latin distich : then follow the words "c'est," and then follows a translation, not of the Latin verses, but of the English ones.

Mr. Macaulay's explanation compels us to assume (1) that the six English lines were not the work of the writer of the *Ancren Riwe*, but were already current and generally known—an assumption for which there is no support. We must then further assume (2) that the author of the original French *Ancren Riwe* not only knew these English lines, but was so bemused by them that, having quoted a Latin distich and wishing to translate it into French, he translated these six English lines instead, and offered them to his readers as being what they are not, viz. a French prose translation of the Latin ; (3) that then the English translator, adroitly seeing what had happened, substituted the English *verse* in place of the French prose translation, and thus gave us for the first time an intelligible sequence : the Latin distich followed by a free paraphrase into English verse.

I think it must be agreed that this involves quite illegitimate assumptions. We must assert with confidence that at this point it is the French text which is translated from the English, and not the reverse, unless, like the undergraduate in *Punch*, we are prepared to scorn Virgil as being nothing but a literal translation of the crib.

Unfortunately this does not quite settle the question of the priority of the two versions of the *Rule*. The mediæval scribes had a baffling habit of interpolating and correcting manuscripts from various sources. Now we know that the French copy from which the extant French manuscript was transcribed must have had at least one very serious gap: the scribe copied continuously without noticing the hiatus. It might conceivably be argued that this French copy may have had other gaps, which the scribe noticed, and filled in (having no second French copy at hand) by borrowing an English copy and translating these missing pieces; and that therefore the demonstrable fact that in one place the only extant French manuscript is translated from the English must not without further examination be held to prove that the whole of the French version is a translation. Comparison of manuscripts, and the transcribing of manuscripts from two sources, one of which was used to supplement deficiencies in the other, were processes constantly going on in the Middle Ages. Thus a monk of St. Martin's, Tournai, tells us that the library had such a reputation that its books were constantly sought by all for the purpose of correcting their copies;* and Guigo, prior of the Grande Chartreuse, finding his copy of Hilary on the Psalms corrupt, writes to Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, asking for the loan of the Cluny copy; Peter does not send it because he finds that the Cluny copy has the same corruption of which Guigo had complained. On the other hand, Peter asks for the loan of Augustine's letters; the Cluny copy had been lent to one of the outlying hermitages, and a large portion of the opening correspondence between Augustine and Jerome had been unfortunately devoured by a bear.†

Similarly, it might be argued, by those who believe that the

* Abbot Odo kept as many as twelve young monks at work copying: Unde omnes libros Ieronimi, . . . beati Gregorii, et quoscumque invenire potuit beati Augustini, Ambrosii, Hysidori, Bede, necnon etiam domni Anselmi . . . postea vero Cantuariensis archiepiscopi, tam diligenter fecit describi, ut vix in aliqua vicinarum ecclesiarum similis inveniretur bibliotheca, omnesque pro corrigendis libris suis de nostra ecclesia peterent exemplaria. Pertz, SS. xiv. 313.

† Tractatum autem beati Hilarii super Psalmos ideo non misi, quia eandem in nostro codice quam et in vestro corruptionem inveni. Quod si et talem vultis, remandate, et mittam. Prosperum contra Cassianum, sicut nostis, non habemus, sed pro eo ad sanctum Joannem Angeliacensem in Aquitania misimus, et iterum, si necesse fuerit, mitemus. Mittite et vos nobis, si placet, majus volumen Epistolarum sancti patris Augustini: quod in ipso pene initio continet epistolas ejusdem ad sanctum Hieronymum, et sancti Hieronymi ad ipsum. Nam magnam partem nostrarum, in quadam obedientia, casu comedit ursus.

Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, cxxxvi. 106. Petrus Venerabilis, Cluniacensis abbas nonus, Venerabili Patri Guigoni, Carthusiensi priori (*Epistolarum liber i.* 24).

French is the original, that, in this French original, the Latin distich was quoted without any translation ; that then, when the English translator came to render the French *Rule*, he felt the necessity of some explanation of these two Latin lines, and so inserted the English six-line paraphrase ; that then some ultra-conscientious and very stupid French scribe, who was transcribing the French version, compared the English version to see if he could improve and correct his French text, and that it was in this way that a translation of these English lines came to be inserted into the French *Rule*.

Considering the ways of scribes, these things are conceivable ; and for this reason, however clear the evidence may be of certain manuscript relationships, we should never allow it to blind us to the possibility of other relationships in an exactly opposite direction. Still, the fact remains that in the one place where, owing to the occurrence of verse, a conclusive test is possible, the test demands an English original. Only very strong evidence in a contrary direction can shake this, or justify us in making highly hypothetical conjectures to account for the plain fact.

The reason why Mr. Macaulay rejected the obvious inference from the English verses was that he had found fifteen instances where the English appeared to him to be a translation from the French. The general respect for Mr. Macaulay's great knowledge seems to have caused his argument to be accepted by most students without further scrutiny.

About four years ago, however, a detailed examination of these passages was made by Miss D. M. E. Dymes, and her results have recently been published.* They are of the utmost importance. Miss Dymes shows how double-edged Mr. Macaulay's arguments are. In most of the fifteen cases there *has* clearly been a misunderstanding. But whether the English writer mistook the meaning of the French or the French of the English admits of dispute ; both versions make sense. Miss Dymes gives an elaborate analysis of each case : in six passages there is nothing to decide either way ; in one case there is, perhaps, a slight superiority in the French wording ; in the eight other cases Miss Dymes finds reason to think the English reading the original. She shows that, on abstract grounds, the English makes rather better sense than the French,

* Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, vol. ix., *The Original Language of the Ancren Riwle* (1924).

sometimes very much better sense; and she brings in, with devastating effect, a consideration which Mr. Macaulay had overlooked—the question as to which reading could more easily have grown out of the other. How much weight can be attached to these fifteen instances of real or apparent mistranslation remains open to question; but that the weight, such as it is, favours an English and not a French original is, after Miss Dymes' excellent demonstration, no longer disputable.

There are other weighty criteria favouring the English, of which Mr. Macaulay knew, but to which he attached strangely little value. For instance there is a rhymed proverb,* and there are two plays upon words,† in the English version. The French agrees with the English closely,‡ *without* rhyme or play upon words. Surely it would be very extraordinary if an English translator, following his original so closely, had managed to work in these decorations.

One further argument there is, which has not, I think, as yet been used. The *Ancren Riwele* belongs to a group of writings to which the English *St. Margaret* also belongs. If the original *Rule* was addressed to the sisters in the English language, it is probable that, amongst the books which they are admonished to read, some at least would be in English; and we find accordingly in the English version "Have ye not this also concerning Ruffin the devil, in your *English* book of St. Margaret?" § The writer of the *Ancren Riwele* knew all about the anchoresses and what books they had; he was, in fact, their "master." But there is no reason to suppose that the translator, who adapted the *Rule* for some other community which used a language different from that of the original anchoresses, knew these private details or took interest in them; we should therefore expect such translation rather to tone down the personal details of the original. And the French speaks simply of "your book of St. Margaret." || We can be fairly certain that personal details are original. Many alterations the scribes would be prone

* Morton, p. 96. The same proverb is repeated in the additions of the revised "Corpus" text (*Modern Language Review*, ix. 467).

† Morton, pp. 62, 332.

‡ Part of one passage is obliterated in the French.

§ Nabbe ze þis also of Ruffin þe deuol, Beliales broðer, in our Engliche boc of Seinte Margarete (Morton, p. 244).

Morton mistranslates as "our English book," but he corrects the error in the glossary: "our English book" would be *ure Engliche boc*.

|| Naeuz vous cest ausi de Rufon le diable frere a belial en vostre liure de seinte margarete, fol 37, v.

to make, but it would be an anachronism to suspect them of adding, like Pooh-Bah, "corroborative detail intended to give artistic verisimilitude to a bald and unconvincing narrative." Of course, though the translator would not be likely to add to the details about the original anchoresses, details appropriate to those for whom he was translating the work might well come to be recorded. We shall see that a case of this occurs in the association of the Latin version (and that version alone) with Tarente. But where, as here, some detail is vouched for as original by its occurrence in both versions ("your book of St. Margaret"), then the version which gives this in its fullest detail ("your English book of St. Margaret") is likely to be the original one.

Finally, it should be said that Dr. Joseph Hall, in his *Selections from Early Middle English*, has edited two passages from the *Rule*, giving indeed a model edition of the closing pages. He has compared the two versions throughout these passages, and finds no trace of English mistranslations from the French, but several of French mistranslations from the English. His general comparison of the two is noteworthy: "The English has all the vigour and raciness of an original work, while the French gives the impression of being unidiomatic and wanting in spontaneity."

The question arises: How did a scholar like Mr. Macaulay come to attach such importance to a number of double-edged arguments as to make him overlook the clearest evidence to the contrary? The answer is found in his own words: "the *a priori* probabilities are of course in favour of the supposition that the English was translated from the French." Now this may be true enough in dealing with the fourteenth century—the period with which Mr. Macaulay was most conversant, and where he had such extraordinary knowledge alike of Anglo-French, Anglo-Latin, and English, as his edition of Gower in those three languages testifies. But at the date when the *Ancren Riwe* was written, the matter is different. Of course it is difficult to fix that date exactly; but few scholars are found who would date it much before 1140 or much after 1220. Now, during this period the *a priori* probabilities are surely in favour of English.

An English prose had been deliberately created by King Alfred, three centuries before the rise of French prose. This tradition was continued by a group of scholars of whom Ælfric is the best known:

Ælfric, "the great master of prose in all its forms." "Ælfric," says Professor Ker, "works on principles that would have been approved by Dryden." * English even became an official language alongside of Latin at the King's Chancery, in a way which cannot be paralleled on the Continent. The Conqueror had to recognize this; we have records of at least twenty-six documents issued by him in English; † but of course not a single one in French. After the Conquest English historical prose continued its life, albeit feebly, in some of the monasteries, and did not finally expire at Peterborough till a date later than that to which some students would attribute the composition of the *Ancren Riwle*. The use of English prose for religious purposes persisted, whilst early Anglo-Norman showed a marked preference for verse.

If then the *Ancren Riwle* was first written in Anglo-Norman, it was unprecedented, in that it was certainly the most considerable prose work in its own particular kind which, so far as we know, had been written in that language at that date; if it was first written in English it was the culmination of a great and still living tradition. It might conceivably be either; but I should have thought that the *a priori* probabilities were on the side of the English.

But there is a further consideration. In the two centuries following the composition of the *Ancren Riwle*, there is of course no doubt that the circumstances changed in favour of French prose. It was one of the most glorious periods of French prose—the age of Villehardouin, Joinville, Froissart, and the prose *Lancelot*. During this period the *a priori* probability is that any work, such as "Mandeville," extant both in French and English prose, was originally written in French. It is not only that official prose was always either Latin or, like Britton's *Epitome of English Law*, French. Englishmen habitually wrote their letters in French. If a body of tradesmen or craftsmen met together to draw up the rules of their guild, such rules would be in French rather than English. An official proclamation addressed even to humble people is always in French, if it is not in Latin; it seems to be assumed that, if a man can read or write at all, he can of course read French. Of the documents illustrating citizen life in London during the reigns of Edward I., II., III., which Mr. Riley collected, more than two-thirds are in Latin, the remainder either in French or in French together with

* Ker: *English Literature—Medieval*, 55.

† Calendered by Davis, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, Oxford, 1913.

Latin; not one is in English.* It is not till the reign of Richard II. that English begins, very tentatively, to make its reappearance in civic affairs. Before this, Wyclif had been using English, but with a clumsiness which contrasts with the ease of English verse, whether in the hands of Chaucer and Gower or of the alliterative poets, or even of inferior craftsmen like Minot. Not till the fifteenth century do we find an English *prose* which can rival that of the *Ancren Riwle*.

Now it was just during these two centuries of French ascendancy that the manuscripts of the *Ancren Riwle* were being multiplied. There is one French manuscript, whilst there are eight English.† Further, the Latin is translated from the English, not from the French. Now assuming the English to be the original, this is intelligible; for if the French translation came to be made decades after the English, it is easy to understand that the English might well have had such a start that the French, in spite of the popularity of that tongue, could not catch it up. But if the work is really a French work, it is difficult to see why, during this period when French prose was so fashionable and English prose so depressed, the English manuscripts should be so much more numerous than the French. Of course, it may be said that the French *were* more numerous, but that a mere accident has led to the preservation of the English and the destruction of the French. This may be so. *A priori* appearances may be misleading; but, for what they are worth, the *a priori* appearances are all in favour of the English being the original.

There remains, then, no argument whatever in favour of French as the original language of the *Rule*, whilst the converging arguments in favour of English are many of them so strong that only conclusive documentary evidence to the contrary could shake them. The question of the authorship does not allow of so satisfactory a solution. The Latin version says that Simon of Ghent wrote it for his sisters at Tarente. Simon was Bishop of Salisbury, and died in 1315; language and palæography make it impossible that he can have been the author of the English version, though we may accept the statement as evidence that he is the author of the Latin recension. This was recognised by Morton when he edited the English text; but Morton was led by the mention of Tarente (presumably Tarrent Kaines in Dorsetshire) to attribute the English *Rule* to an earlier

* Riley, *Memorials of London*, 1868.

† Two fragmentary.

Bishop of Salisbury, Richard Poore, bishop from 1217 to 1229. Poore is said to have been born at Tarrent, he refounded the nunnery there, returned from Durham, whither he had been translated, came to Tarrent in his last sickness in 1237, and was buried there. But the mention of Tarrent is found only in the Latin version, and there only as the name of the nunnery where the sisters of Simon of Ghent were. We have no reason to suppose that the original author had any connection with Tarrent: and his connection with Tarrent is the sole claim which Poore possesses to the authorship of the *Ancren Riwele*.

In 1916 Father Vincent McNabb, O.P., put forward the claim that the author was a Dominican Friar, and probably Friar Robert Bacon.* In the first part of this theory, he was following J. B. Dalgairns, who, as Father McNabb points out, had written, in 1870, "the only thing that is certain is that it [the *Rule*] was written by a Dominican; for the list of prayers which the writer enumerates as having been in use among the lay brethren of his Order are nearly identical with those ordered in the Rule of St. Dominic."† The passage upon which this theory rests runs:

Our lay bretheren say thus their hours: for Uhtsong (Matins) on work days (ferial days) eight and twenty Pater Nosters; on holy-days (feast-days) forty; for Evensong, fifteen; etc. . . . If any of you will do this, she followeth here, as in other observances, much of our order.‡

Now, as Miss Allen points out, this passage is found only in one manuscript. That, in itself, is no fatal objection to its authenticity. For the *Rule* was written originally for the three recluses, and then was copied as a general book of devotion applicable to much wider circles; so it was quite natural that certain passages should come to be missed out in most copies. The serious objection is that this passage seems quite inconsistent with the *Rule*, as written for these three original recluses. These recluses were obviously able to read Latin, French, and English. The writer goes so far as to say; "Often, dear sisters, ye ought to pray less that ye may read more. Reading is good prayer." § This, Mr. Macaulay remarks, || is "contrary to the usual teaching, but quite in harmony with the sound common sense of the *Ancren Riwele*." And, in accordance

* *Modern Language Review*, xi. 1-8.

† Introductory Essay to Walter Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*.

‡ Morton, p. 24.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

|| *Modern Language Review*, ix. 73.

with this, the sisters have just been given elaborate instructions how to say their hours, instructions which show that they are educated women, who can use service books: "Let every one say her hours as she has them written." * Then suddenly we have this alternative method of saying the hours "as our lay brethren do," obviously intended for illiterate devotees. The fact that this alternative method is found in one manuscript only, makes us quite certain that it must be the addition of some scribe (possibly enough a Dominican). But the essential reason for rejecting it is not that it is found in one MS. only, but that it is inconsistent with the rest of the *Rule*. As Miss Allen says, "the omission of the passage from all other copies is the least suspicious detail in its connection."

Another passage in which "our lay brethren" are mentioned as partaking of the Holy Communion only fifteen times a year † has better manuscript authentication. But until this rule is shown to be peculiar to *Dominican* lay brethren, it is of no help to the argument. And so far is this from being the case, that Father Dalgairns (to whose authority Father McNabb more than once appeals) speaks of communicating fifteen times a year as "the practice of the Church at the time." ‡

Again, Father McNabb's other parallels between the *Rule* and Dominican usages, and the mention of austerities practised by a certain man and a certain woman, have been shown by Miss Allen § and by Mr. Coulton || to refer to practices too widespread to carry the weight of the argument. Some of these parallels might perhaps have possessed some corroborative value, if the argument about the hours of "our lay-brethren," which is quite the most striking, could have been maintained. But when that has fallen, none of the others seem sufficient to support the theory. ¶

Miss Hope Emily Allen has suggested that the three maidens

* Morton, p. 20.

† *Ibid.*, p. 412.

‡ *The Spiritual Life of Mediæval England*, p. xiv., in Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*, 1901.

§ *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxxiii. 538-546.

|| *Modern Language Review*, xvii. 66-69.

¶ Father McNabb answers Miss Allen's objections in the *Modern Language Review*, xv. 406-9. He produces additional evidence, turning upon the use of the *Ave Maria*. The value of some of this argument is difficult for laymen to estimate, as references are not given; the rest has been proved by Mr. Coulton (*Modern Language Review*, xvii. 68) to have no force. Miss Allen's answer to Father McNabb's reply is moderate, and, I think, convincing (*Modern Language Review*, xvi. 316-322).

for whom the *Ancren Riwle* was composed might be identified with the *tribus puellis*, *Emmæ videlicet et Gunildæ et Christinæ*, to whom the hermitage of Kilburn was granted by the Abbot and convent of Westminster between 1127 and 1135. A brief summary cannot do justice to Miss Allen's argument, and all interested in the *Ancren Riwle* must read her article.* In both cases the women are three *includæ*, young, noble, richly endowed, beadswomen, living under a master.† The Kilburn anchoresses had been "*domicellæ cameræ*" to "good Queen Maud," the wife of Henry I., the daughter of St. Margaret of Scotland, and the niece of Edgar the Atheling. The name Gunhilda, Miss Allen remarks, suggests Anglo-Danish rather than Norman origin, and all three names occur in the family of Edward the Confessor. Now all this fits in excellently with the tone of the *Ancren Riwle*, which surprises us by being both English and courtly at a date when we do not expect to find those two things combined.

One of the greatest services rendered by Mr. Macaulay to the study of the *Rule* was his discovery that the best and probably the earliest manuscript (*Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 402) is itself a revision of the original *Rule*. This revision must have been made some time after the coming of the Friars to England, for it refers to "Our Friars Preachers and Our Friars Minors."‡ Yet the manuscript thus revised is the most correct, and so Mr. Macaulay suggests a date not earlier, but not much later, than 1230. The compiler of this revision has in view a larger number of anchoresses than the original three. The reviser gives instruction with regard to a visitation from the Bishop—and his attitude to the Bishop is peculiarly gingerly. The anchoresses are instructed to "hie forthwith towards him, and sweetly beseech him, if he asketh to

* *The Origin of the Ancren Riwle*, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxxiii. 1918, pp. 474-546.

† Miss Allen in *Modern Language Review*, xvi. 1921, pp. 316-322, *The Ancren Riwle and Kilburn Priory*.

‡ It is noteworthy that the original *Rule* nowhere speaks of "Friars." This original *Rule* is found in *Cotton Titus D. xviii.* and in *Cotton Nero A. xiv.* (the latter manuscript contains the passage about the hours of "our lay bretheren" which is peculiar to itself, and demonstrably an interpolation). These two manuscripts are of the first half of the thirteenth century. A rather later manuscript, *Cotton Cleopatra C. vi.* gives the original *Rule*, but with extracts from the later recension copied in the margin. Considering the bulk of the original *Rule*, the absence of any mention of "Friars" would seem strange, unless we date it before their arrival in England. This certainly, as Miss Allen remarks (p. 543), makes very difficult the theory of Father McNabb that a Friar is the author of the original *Rule*.

see you, that ye may in that respect hold you towards him as ye have done and do to all others," *i.e.* remain veiled. "If he will anyway have a sight, look that it be full short; the veil anon down, and draw you behind."

Now between 1225 and 1231 there was dispute between the Abbey of Westminster and the Bishop of London with regard to jurisdiction over the cell of Kilburn. It was settled in 1231 by a Commission appointed by the Pope. The bishop was given the right of hearing "*confessio privata*" at Kilburn.

It is clear that by this date the Kilburn community had also grown to a greater number than that of the original three anchoresses. Further, both the new Kilburn regulations and the revised *Rule* seem to point to the necessity of stricter supervision. If we identify the two, we get a very consistent picture. As Miss Allen says: "the writer of the new passages [in the *Rule*] would doubtless be on the side of the abbot in the controversy," and this, she surmises, "perhaps accounts for the somewhat suspicious manner which he shows towards the bishop." The Abbey resisted the bishop's claims over itself, but had to sacrifice the Kilburn sisterhood, and left it to the anchoresses to put the bishop in his place: "3ef he wule allegat habben a sihðe, lokið þet hit beo ful scheort." As Miss Allen says, this is "perhaps the strongest piece of evidence for the identification, apart from the similarity in the circumstances of the original *inclusæ*." *

On the other hand, there are grave difficulties in the way of the identification, and, with characteristic thoroughness, Miss Allen herself points them out.

There is a clear connection between the *Ancren Riwe* and St. Aelred's *De vita eremitica ad sororem liber*. In one place our text of the *Rule* refers to this: "as Saint Aelred wrote to his sister." Aelred was not canonised till 1191—yet the insertion of the word "Saint" might, of course, simply be the work of a scribe.† But any reference to St. Aelred's letter would seem to make the connection with the three Kilburn anchoresses difficult. For Queen Maud, to whom the three Kilburn anchoresses had been "*domicellæ cameræ*," died in 1118. The *domicellæ* may, of course, have been

* P. 494.

† It is, however, found in the original version, in all three MSS.: *Saint Aldret*, Nero; *Saint Ailreade*, Titus; *Saint Ailret*, Cleopatra.

only children, and have been at the queen's court only for a few months before her death. But even so, they can hardly have been younger than St. Aelred, who was born in 1109. The tone of St. Aelred's letter to his sister is not that of a young man, and he refers to his sister's advanced age,* as Miss Allen reminds us.† Yet it is very clear from the *Rule* that the recluses for whom it was written were young.‡ Here too Miss Allen agrees.§ Her explanation would be that St. Aelred (who admits that he has no experience in guiding recluses, and writes from the works of "doctors") is perhaps himself drawing upon the *Ancren Riwele*, in which case the citation in the *Ancren Riwele* "as Saint Aelred wrote to his sister" would be the addition of a scribe who had noted the resemblance of the two texts.|| It is a possible explanation, but not the obvious one.

"The most conspicuous obstacle" Miss Allen feels to be that "St. Bernard (either with or without the 'Saint') is quoted thirteen times." However, the difficulty is not, she thinks, insuperable. The author was, she says, a contemporary of St. Bernard.

But this difficulty becomes much more serious if, as I am afraid is the case, some of these quotations come, not from St. Bernard himself, but from the Bernardine literature of the generation succeeding the saint's death.

One of the most difficult problems will, I think, be found to lie in Part VI., "Of Penance." "Nimeð nu god 3eme," says the writer of the *Rule*, "vor hit is almeist Seint Beornardes Sentence." This has always been explained as "it is nearly all from the *Liber Sententiarum* of St. Bernard."¶ This, however, is not the case. This section of the *Rule* seems to have nothing in common with Bernard's *Sententie* or his *Alia Sententie* nor with the *Liber Sententiarum*: all these are collections of disconnected passages.** In the opening pages of this Part VI.,†† the elect are described as

* Nulla vobis de macie vultus, de exilitate brachiorum, de cutis asperitate sit cura. Hæc tibi, soror (gratias deo), dicenda non fuerant: sed quia nec solum propter te, sed etiam propter adolescentiores, quæ similem vitam tuo consilio arripere gestiunt, hanc tibi formulam tradi voluisti, hæc interserenda putavi.

Migne, xxxii. 1454. St. Aelred, *De vita eremitica ad sororem liber*.

† P. 530.

‡ See, especially, Morton, p. 56.

§ P. 476.

|| P. 529.

¶ So Morton; and Hall, *Selections*, ii. 375.

** The *Liber Sententiarum* (§ 142, see Migne, *Pat. Lat.* clxxxiv. section 783, column 1151), and the *Ancren Riwele* (Morton, p. 356) both give a mystical interpretation of the wheels of the Chariot of Elijah. But it is not the same.

†† Morton, pp. 348-354.

of three classes : those who are pilgrims in this world ; those who are dead to the world ; and those who are crucified to the world. All this is a free translation of Bernard's Seventh Lenten Sermon, *De peregrino, mortuo et crucifixo* : * the vivid phrases of the *Ancren Riwe* compare very well with Bernard's more commonplace Latin, but that the whole discourse is based on Bernard's sermon is undeniable. There is here no chronological impossibility, however.

The pages which follow are from a book of "Sentences," but not one issued by Bernard.

The book of "Sentences" from which the author of the *Ancren Riwe* seems to have drawn is the *Sententiæ Exceptæ*, also known as the *Declamationes*, a book compiled from the sayings of St. Bernard by his secretary and biographer Geoffrey of Auxerre. From this book comes the text *Vilitas et asperitas*,† which both treatises associate with the *Vide humilitatem et laborem* of the Psalmist, and which both treatises speak of as the two sides of the ladder reaching to heaven.

"Vilitas et asperitas." Vilt
and asprete, þeos two þinges,
scheome and pine, ase Seint
Bernard seið, beoð þe two leddre
stalen þet beoð upriht to þe
heouene, and bitwonen þeos stalen
beoð þe tindres ivestned of alle gode
þeawes, bi hwuche me climbeð to þe
blisse of heouene. And forði þet
David hefde þeos two stalen of
pisse leddre, þauh he king were, he
clomb upward and seide baldeliche
to ure Louerd "Vide humilitatem
meam et laborem meum."

Vide humilitatem meam et la-
borem meum. Hæc ergo sint
latera scalæ, vilitas et asperitas,
quibus deinceps internæ virtutis et
gratiæ gradus firmiter inserantur.

From the same source comes the second sentence quoted as from St. Bernard in this section of the *Rule*, *In sedibus quies imperturbata : in iudicio honoris eminentia commendatur*.‡ Here again the sentence is quoted in association with the same text of scripture in both

* Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, clxxxiii. (vol. 2 of St. Bernard's Works, § 826, col. 183).

† Morton 354; cf. *Gaufridi Abbatis Declamationes*, xxxvi., being section 301 or column 460 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, clxxxiv. (vol. 3 of St. Bernard's works).

‡ Morton, p. 359; in *Gaufridi Abbatis Declamationes* this comes at the end of cap. xl., being section 303 or column 463 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, clxxxiv. (vol. 3 of St. Bernard's works). The only difference is that the Bernardine tract has *dignitatis* where the *Rule* has *honoris*.

treatises, *Sedebitis et vos judicantes*. These four quotations come together, within two pages of the *Rule*, and are similarly contiguous in the *Sententie*: this part of the *Sententie* is in fact the inspiration of much of this section of the *Rule*, although exact verbal coincidence is confined to the four passages I have quoted.

That connection exists between the two treatises is, I think, undeniable. It becomes therefore of importance to date the *Sententie* of Geoffrey of Auxerre, who was issuing Bernardine literature at intervals between 1145 and 1188. The *Sententie* must apparently fall between the years 1153 and 1179.* Taking the earliest possible year, and assuming that the anchoresses were only *domicellæ* of Queen Maud as children for a few months before her death in 1118, it remains impossible that a work in which the anchoresses are referred to as youthful can have been written after the *Sententie*.

Of course it is possible that the *Rule* and the *Sententie* are both drawing upon some passage in Bernard's sermons in which the two dicta of Bernard and the two verses from scripture come together in this way. (In that case the reference in the *Rule* to St. Bernard's "sentence" must be taken as meaning simply St. Bernard's "opinion," and as involving no reference to the *Sententie*.)

But I know of no such passage. It is true that the text *Sedebitis Judicantes* is a favourite one of St. Bernard,† and further that in one place he connects this text with the exclamation of the Psalmist, *Vide humilitatem meam et laborem meum*. This shame and suffering, he says (in the Sermon on the birthday of St. Benedict),‡ will be rewarded by repose, signified in sitting, and

* The date usually given is between 1155 and 1161, because in one manuscript Geoffrey is spoken of as Abbot of Igny, a post he can have held only in these years (*Histoire littéraire de la France*, xiv. 445). The argument does not seem very conclusive, for in another manuscript Cardinal Henry of Pisa, to whom the work is dedicated, is described as *Romanæ Ecclesiæ subdiaconum*, an office he was holding in 1148. What seems conclusive is that whilst, in dedicating the book to Henry, Geoffrey takes responsibility for the wording, he insists that the sense is Bernard's, except in so far as his own ignorance or forgetfulness may have corrupted it. He asks for Henry's criticism. During the life of St. Bernard, when Geoffrey as secretary and companion was in constant touch with his master, this would surely have been unreasonable; after the death of Bernard in 1153 it is natural, especially as Henry had himself been a disciple of Bernard, and monk of Clairvaux some time between 1148 and 1150. Henry became Cardinal in 1150 and died in 1179. (Chacon, *Vita Pontificum*, i. 1047-8, Romæ, 1677.)

† It comes, for example, in the eighth sermon on *qui habitat* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, clxxxiii. vol. 2 of St. Bernard's Works, § 849, col. 215); again in *Sermo v. pro dominica 1 Novembris*, § 950, col. 354; again in the *Sermones de diversis*, § 1151, col. 628.

‡ §§ 970, 971, col. 381.

honour, signified in judging. The underlying idea is the same as that in Geoffrey's *Sententiæ Exceptæ*, and is probably the germ of Geoffrey's more elaborate discourse. But the elaborations found in Geoffrey and in the *Ancren Riwe* are not found in Bernard's Sermon on the birthday of St. Benedict. Nothing is there said of shame and suffering as the two side-pieces of the ladder, in which the other virtues are then inserted as rungs. Again, Bernard says simply, *Ecce quies sessionis et honor iudicii*, where Geoffrey and the *Ancren Riwe* agree upon the wording, *In sedibus quies imperturbata, in iudicio dignitatis [or honoris] eminentia commendatur*.

Some student well versed in St. Bernard's works and Bernardine literature may be able to point to some earlier channel than Geoffrey of Auxerre, through which these ideas and phrases may have reached the author of the *Ancren Riwe*; but until it is found, I feel that there are serious chronological difficulties in supposing that the *Ancren Riwe*, in anything like the form in which it has come down to us, was written for the three girls, Emma, Gunilda and Christina.

But since the *Rule* has demonstrably undergone three adaptations (the revision of about 1230, the Latin adaptation of about 1300, and the fourteenth-century English adaptation preserved in MS. Pepys 2498), nothing could be more likely than that it had undergone yet another adaptation. Such adaptation might well have taken place in the century between the year (1127-1135) when Emma, Gunilda and Christina withdrew from the world, and the years following 1230, to which the manuscripts of the oldest form of the text belong. There is nothing therefore to prevent those who wish, from believing in what the Germans would call an *Ur-Ancren-Riwe*, which is now lost, but which may have been written for the three Kilburn recluses by Godwin their "master," and have been revised by a student of the works of Bernard and Aelred into the form in which we find it in the Cottonian manuscripts, Nero and Titus. This is pure hypothesis, but something may still turn up to verify it. As Miss Allen says:

Verification sufficient to convince the doubter may come from any quarter, and in view of the wide implications it is desirable that the hypothesis should be given the widest possible publicity, in the hope of gaining the widest possible co-operation.

The present writer can only hope that evidence may be found

to prove Miss Allen's theory, and to dissipate the objections which he himself has felt bound to raise and which, as he fully realises, may arise simply from his own ignorance of the religious literature of the age. But even should it prove impossible finally to identify the three sisters of the *Rule* with the three devotees of Kilburn, the value of Miss Allen's article will hardly be diminished. For that value lies above all in the way in which Miss Allen has linked up the *Ancren Riwele* with the religious movements of the twelfth century, and shown it as the work of a man living at a time of many strong religious influences, sensitive to all, but not giving the zeal of a partizan to any.*

Attention must also be called to the theory of authorship propounded by Dr. Joseph Hall in the model edition of some pages of the *Rule* which forms a part of his quite invaluable *Selections from Early Middle English*. Dr. Hall thinks that a good case might be made out for St. Gilbert of Sempringham (1089-1189), who was, as he says, "famous as the greatest director of pious women in England."† When St. Gilbert died, his order of Gilbertines numbered fifteen hundred women. But is this a reason for attributing to him the *Ancren Riwele*? The anchoresses for whom the *Ancren Riwele* was written were the chief care of the writer ("mine leoue sustren, wummen me leouest" ‡), although he was of course acquainted with other devout women ("ancren þet ich iknowe" §). They belong to no order, and have been troubled with questions on that account. The writer of the *Rule* sees no reason why they should belong to any order, and with some indignation tells them to reply to these unwise and foolish || questioners that their religion and order is that of St. James, "pure religion and undefiled . . . is . . . to keep oneself unspotted from the world."

Now I would place no bounds to the charity of a saint, and I am prepared to believe (if evidence is forthcoming) that St. Gilbert spared time from his many and heavy duties to write for three anchoresses, who did not even belong to his order, this laborious work ("God knows, I would rather set out on a pilgrimage to Rome than begin to do it again" ¶). The writer of the *Rule* was obviously a saintly man. But let us not, in the absence of evidence, diminish

* *Modern Language Review*, xvi. 322.

† Morton, p. 116.

|| Unweote, unwise. Morton, pp. 8, 10.

‡ *Selections*, ii. 375.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

¶ Morton, p. 430.

the number of the elect by identifying him with St. Gilbert. There are of course, as there cannot help but be, parallels between the *Ancren Riwe* and the Gilbertine regulations. But there are also contrasts. The emphasis laid upon cleanliness has often been noted as a peculiar feature of the *Ancren Riwe* ("Wascheð ou hwarse 3e habbeð neode, ase ofte ase 3e wulleð" *). The Gilbertines were warned *de prohibitione balnei* :

Caveatur ab omnibus nostris balneum, cum sit libidinis fomentum ; nec ulla balneatur, nisi graviori labore gravata, vel medicinæ causa, vel scabie occupata.

It is impossible to conclude this rapid sketch of recent work upon the *Rule* without an expression of regret that G. C. Macaulay was not spared to continue the work he had so well begun. Macaulay, with his extraordinary experience of editing books in all three languages, was probably the only man who could have carried through single handed a satisfactory edition of the *Rule*. Meantime, his work is indispensable to all students, and though it must no doubt be in the long run superseded, it has cleared the way for a final edition of this extraordinarily interesting and important text.

* Morton, p. 424. The Corpus Manuscript adds *Nes neauer fulðe godd leof*.

THE PRESENT VALUE OF BYRON *

By OLIVER ELTON

I HAVE taken some care, for a reason that I hope is not arrogant or depreciatory, to read little or nothing of what has been printed on the occasion of the centenary. For this omission my commercially sounding title must be the excuse. What can be meant, at any time, by the "present value" of a poet? It is not to be measured by sales and editions, or by the rightful if passing glow of enthusiasm that prompts these celebrations. After all, it comes down to each one of us asking, What is Byron to *me*? To "me and many other mes," according to the old Oxford rhyme; but, in the long run, to *this* "me." And that we shall find out best by reading Byron through again, rather than by reading what better judges than ourselves have said about him. Never mind if he was cursed when alive for his bad morals, and after his death for his bad prosody. Let us try to get our own impressions pure. Above all, let us forget all that we ourselves may have written concerning him. Let us go over him once more and ask how far our confused young enthusiasms and dislikes are wearing. Criticism, possibly, is partly the attempt to recover these first inarticulate feelings, and to understand them; the result may be worth more than the mature official judgment which has been overlaid by much reading or teaching. This, no doubt, is not exactly a Wordsworthian view of the "intimations" of our early years. The starting-point is that old, unpurged, Galignani Byron which somehow had got on to the school shelves. What about it now? I will not inflict the process on your patience, but will simply offer the results of a review, in the form of an answer, which will not be at all startling, to a few simple questions; trying to deal very little either in literary history or in eulogy. A mere

* The Byron Lecture, delivered at University College, Nottingham, March 7, 1924 (slightly revised).

show of funeral plumes, a century late, would be still less worthy of the occasion than anything that you may hear to-night.

I have always felt that Byron's future is safe, not only with critics, and not only with persons who care for poetry, but with persons who do not much care for it at all. This may sound a double-edged saying; but it is meant well. It implies, for one thing, that the man, apart from his writings, can never be forgotten, just as Swift, Johnson, and Carlyle can never be forgotten, whatever becomes, in the judgment of Time, of their formal works. I choose these names because they are the English writers of great rank whom we know best personally; and Byron we know in the same way. All four have told us an immense amount about themselves, and others have told us almost more about them. Over the other three Byron has at least one advantage: he has spoken of himself, and at great length, both in his best prose and in his best verse. I have met various people who have very little sense for literature, but who could not keep away from Byron. Mr. Murray, writing a few years ago, speaks of the stream of pilgrims who come to see his Byron museum. For the man is still an enigma, although the broad lines of his character are familiar. Nor does the interest in Byron depend upon unsolved scandals, which so far as I am concerned may go down to their own place in the gutter. It is doubtful whether, after all, they throw any but a doubtful and indirect light upon his poetry. Nor, again, does the interest depend on any "message," or deep philosophical idea, that Byron can furnish. It depends on his mixed and large humanity, on his way of continually disappointing us, and of suddenly recovering himself, and triumphing, both as a poet and as a man.

1. The first, then, of my questions is this: *Can he tell a story?* The gift of narrative is, of course, not implied in, nor does it imply, the poetic gift. The two things *may* go together; but they need not, in mathematical language, vary together. Even when they go together, as in Chaucer and William Morris they do, they are still different. Gower, Chaucer's friend, is something of a poet, but he is much more of a tale-teller; and his narrative ease carries him through when the poetry wears thin. When Shelley tries to tell a tale, his poetic gift just carries him through when the narrative wears thin. As to Byron, he begins very ill in this particular, and for a long time he does not improve at all; but at last he disappoints us pleasantly. His series of lays, poured out so fast, and so wildly

successful at the time, are mostly, as stories, poor things, not only in subject but in treatment. The *Giaour*, he said himself, was but a string of passages. The *Bride of Abydos* is an anecdote. In the *Corsair* there is a tale, but it is swamped in declamation. The *Siege of Corinth*, with its rough but not ineffective variations on the subtle rhythms of *Christabel*, has a splendid descriptive energy. The picture of the siege lives ; but it is hardly a story. In *Parisina* something does happen ; there is at least one tragic moment ; it is the most genuine of all these early tales ; and there is a note of high-strained but sincere pathos. *The Prisoner of Chillon* does not profess to be a story, except for the slow tortures of the dungeon. In all these poems there is a great momentum, a profusion of rhetorical and passionate matter, which is rather dull to-day, and a halfpennyworth of story. Byron's lays displaced those of Scott in the ear of the many ; and Scott, in his modest way, accepted the finding of the many ; too modestly ; for his own lays, I think, wear far better than most of Byron's. His *Battle of Flodden* and his *Lord of the Isles* leave a far more satisfactory and distinct impression ; and, as the sequel was to show, he was a tale-teller born. But Byron had not come to the end of his tether. He got these lays behind him, and then he found out a better method. And he found it, the moment that he brought to bear, or rather that he ceased to forgo, his gift of humour, of irony, and of portraying real life. This change is evident in *Mazeppa*, written while he was already deep in *Don Juan*. *Mazeppa*, as a poem, and also as a tale, is alive. There is not only the speed and magnificence of the ride, in which Scott for once is matched on Scott's own ground, but there is the light vivacity of the setting :

There was a certain Palatine,
A count of far and high descent,
Rich as a salt or silver mine ;
And he was proud, ye may divine,
As if from heaven he had been sent ;
He had such wealth in blood and ore
As few could match beneath the throne ;
And he would gaze upon his store,
And o'er his pedigree would pore,
Until by some confusion led,
Which almost look'd like want of head,
He thought their merits were his own.
His wife was not of his opinion ;
His junior she by thirty years,
Grew daily tired of his dominion. . . .

And in the same strain the story closes. *Mazeppa* has been telling

it to the fugitive Charles XII, after the battle of Pultowa, under an oak tree :

And if ye marvel Charles forgot
To thank his tale, *he* wonder'd not,—
The king had been an hour asleep.

In form, *Mazeppa* is still a lay ; but meanwhile, as we know, Byron had hit on quite a different method of story-telling. It was the old, discursive, ironical Italian method. *Beppo* is his gay little first adventure of this kind. It is another anecdote : the husband, long thought to be lost, comes home in the guise of a Turk ; introduces himself, with politeness and tact, to his wife and to his successor, and all goes smoothly. That is the whole ; all the virtue is in the embroidery, in the arabesque ; and these are perfect. Such, too, is the method of *Don Juan*, with its flow of wit, vulgarity—even flat boorishness—confession, observation, colour, and poetry. The poem is a great and permanent landmark in the progress of a particular form ; what with its old forerunners, from Pulci to Casti, and what with the successors to whom it gave an impulse, in France, in Spain, and in Russia. For De Musset, for Espronceda, for Pushkin, that form comes through Byron, with the stamp that Byron set upon it, and does not come directly from the Italian originals. Some of them, like the author of *Eugeny Onegin*, restored a certain plastic delicacy of which Byron was incapable. The main features of his bequest to these authors are two. First of all, he aims, far more violently than do his models (amongst whom we must reckon Frere with his pleasant *Whistlecraft*) at producing a continual sense of shock and discord, as much by his sudden soarings into poetry as by his more frequent and sudden drops into anticlimax. And secondly, Byron's way is to let this mind and story drift—drift back to himself, and then swiftly away again to the subject. And these two traits distinguish him also from Chaucer ; who embroiders indeed and digresses, but who leaves a sense of harmony and not of discord ; and who, when he speaks of himself from time to time, speaks gently, and not for long. There is, of course, the other old Italian way of narrative, which is seen in the prose of the *Decameron* and its successors. Here the teller keeps out of sight, and the story is stripped down to its naked perfection. There is something of this quality in Byron's letters, when he briefly portrays a scene, or recites a scandal.

Byron rises to his full power as a narrator when the tale itself

provides the irony, and he feels that he need not comment much ; when he can go slowly and delightedly from pageant to pageant, interspersing dialogue in verse, a form in which he can be a master, and showing, what in his dramas he does not show, his dramatic power. The familiar fifth canto of *Don Juan* is as good an instance as another. Juan is taken into the slave-market at Constantinople, has a long talk with an older Englishman, who is also on sale ; is carried in female dress to the sultana Gulbeyaz who has caught sight of him, and repels her advances ; begins to relent, but is saved just in time by the appearance of the Sultan. The old attendant gives warning :

"Bride of the Sun ! and Sister of the Moon !"
 ("Twas thus he spake,) "and Empress of the Earth !
 Whose frown would put the spheres all out of tune,
 Whose smile makes all the planets dance with mirth,
 Your slave brings tidings—he hopes not too soon—
 Which your sublime attention may be worth :
 The Sun himself has sent me like a ray,
 To hint that he is coming up this way."

"Is it," exclaimed Gulbeyaz, "as you say ?
 I wish to heaven he would not shine till morning !
 But bid my women form the Milky-way,
 Hence, my old comet ! give the stars due warning—
 And, Christian ! mingle with them as you may,
 And as you'd have me pardon your past scorning"—
 Here they were interrupted by a humming
 Sound, and then by a cry, "The Sultan's coming !"

Here are the qualities that Goethe liked so well, in *Don Juan* and in *The Vision of Judgment*—the nimbleness, the daring, the impudence, the lightness ; and that strain is kept up through 159 stanzas, of which I count about thirty, here and there, that are fairly to be called digressive ; nor do these come too thick when once the story is set going. Byron is much better when he thus moves free of any documents, sailing buoyantly along. Even the digressions reveal *him* to us. Just at the start, he breaks off for seven verses to describe a sight he had seen while actually writing the canto—a man, the commandant, lying ferociously killed, shot dead, in the streets of Ravenna ; this event he describes, in his terse prose, in a letter. The best parts of *Don Juan* run thus easily. Often enough the tale is of choicer fabric than the patched-in comment. In this sense, then, Byron takes his rank among the four or five best English story-tellers in rhyme, from Chaucer to Crabbe, and onwards.

2. My second question is this : *Could Byron sing ?* The world for a long time thought so ; he sang of himself, and the world thought the subject a good one ; and Goethe thought so too, when he said that his Euphorian, who is Byron, had "a song his very own"—*ein eigenster Gesang*. But it is doubtful whether Goethe was thinking there of strictly lyrical power ; he may have been referring to Byron's general poetic gift. And besides, even a great poet may be fallible about the quality of a lyric gift in a language that is not his own. And then Europe, we remember, from Portugal to Sweden, from Athens to Moscow, mostly read Byron in translation ; the library, the mere bibliography, of those translations and of the imitations they bred, can scarcely yet have been catalogued, still less reviewed, as a whole. In England, as we know, the next two generations of poets began to cast doubt on Byron's purity of poetic gift, long before the rest of the world had done so. The discriminations of Matthew Arnold, and his contrast of Leopardi with Byron as a poetic artist, cut deep ; and the still louder disgust of Swinburne, who was a sound judge, when he spoke of Byron's dissonances, was founded in truth. I shall not waste time by going over that ground ; we know pretty well by now what Byron, in the way of song, could not give ; we know all about his lapses of ear, about the deadly commonness that intrudes so often even into his lyric ; and to know this is no credit to us, who have heard these critics, and whose ears have been sharpened by familiarity with Shelley and other artists who are finer than Byron. But what is it in lyric that Byron can and does give us ? This is not so easy to define, but I will try. We need only take him at his best. His best is what it is, and is not affected by the fact that he could be very bad at other times.

We all know the handful of good lyrics that Palgrave saved for his *Golden Treasury* ; and Palgrave's comment helps us to an answer, though I will put it in my own way. Creature of moods, and chameleon, as Byron was, he was not a child of the eighteenth century for nothing. And in the long run, I believe that what we get down to in him is an eighteenth-century characteristic : I mean, the ascendancy of *reason*. I shall press this point again ; but meantime, he does one of the hardest of things : at his best, he reasons in song, and that without ceasing to sing. Song is winged, no doubt, by feeling ; but he reasons *about* feeling. He keeps firmly to his thread ; he is a master of the logic of feeling, which is

not the logic of the mere understanding. He reasons about grief, and estrangement, and his tortured heart, and his absence, and his exile. And it is when he does this, and does it sincerely—sincerely, at least, for the moment, which is all that is required—it is then, I say, that his lyrical gift is purest, his phrase most piercing, and his rhythm safest. No matter whether his *Thyrza* is a real or an imaginary woman. The evidence, on his own word, is that she was real, though we are not sure who she was. Only one, the noblest and most perfect, of his *Thyrza* poems is very widely known; it is in all the books: "And thou art dead, as young and fair." It is a masterpiece of thinking about sorrow, and it is in style as pure as anything in Shelley; and it has more shape, it is more definite and plastic, and leaves a deeper dint on the mind, than almost anything in Shelley; though it must lose, no doubt, by the absence of such an *aura*, or spray of suggestion, as Shelley communicates to his frailest words. There is little of that element in it; nothing is left unsaid; but then, how much is said! I quote, in illustration, from another *Thyrza* piece, "Without a stone to mark the spot," which is far less perfect as a whole:

And didst thou not, since Death for thee
Prepared a light and pangless dart,
Once long for him thou ne'er shalt see,
Who held, and holds thee in his heart?

Oh! who like him had watched thee here?
Or sadly mark'd thy glazing eye,
In that dread hour ere Death appear,
When silent sorrow fears to sigh,

Till all was past?

This, in tone and temper, is unlike most of our romantic verse. The strain is older, and can, I think, be traced back into the age which is falsely supposed to be unpoetical and dispassionate. It has the finish and the inscriptional effect that we associate with our so-called classical period. Do we not sometimes hear in Byron an echo of Rochester? I have often thought that Byron, at his best, might have written some of Rochester's best things; although, it is true, Rochester had more to repent of than Byron, and repented more deeply, and his few singing arrows go home more surely than anything of Byron's; but the affinity is there:

When, weary'd with a world of woe,
To thy safe bosom I retire,
Where Love, and Peace, and Truth does flow,
May I contented there expire. . . .

Byron may not rise to that ; but, in recompense, he has his gift of impassioned reasoning in connected soliloquy, which is not the less spontaneous for all its logic, and which we feel kindling as it proceeds ; it is not thought out beforehand. More than this, he sometimes catches a true song-tune, and shows a musical craft not unlike his friend Moore's. Would any man who was destitute of this craft have shortened by a foot the last line in the following eight ?

For the sword outwears its sheath,
And the soul wears out the breast,
And the heart must pause to breathe,
And love itself have rest.

Though the night was made for loving,
And the day returns too soon,
Yet we'll go no more a-roving
By the light of the moon.

Even in the *Hours of Idleness*, his *péché de jeunesse*, and still more in *Hebrew Melodies*, with " Oh ! snatch'd away in Beauty's bloom " ; and most of all, perhaps, in the three or four poems " To Augusta," this rarer strain is heard. And the most musical of these has, again, an eighteenth-century measure and melody, the melody of Gray's *Amatory Stanzas*, and of Cowper's " The poplars are felled." The passionate or affectionate matter is kept in order and solemnised by the restraint and balance of that good tradition—which, of course, in those earlier hands had not always lent itself to vehement feeling. The second verse rises, no doubt, above the first, which is cast in antitheses. I know it is in the anthologies, but it will bear repeating :

Though human, thou didst not deceive me,
Though woman, thou didst not forsake,
Though loved, thou forborest to grieve me,
Though slander'd, thou never couldst shake ;
Though trusted, thou didst not disclaim me ;
Though parted, it was not to fly ;
Though watchful, 'twas not to defame me,
Nor, mute, that the world might belie. . . .

From the wreck of the past, which hath perish'd,
Thus much I at least may recall,
It hath taught me that what I most cherish'd
Deserv'd to be dearest of all ;
In the desert a fountain is springing,
In the wide waste there still is a tree,
And a bird in the solitude singing,
Which speaks to my spirit of *thee*.

I am not sure that any of the poets who have been Byron's critics wrote anything which they should have been prouder to sign than that. It is needless to speak of his other, his martial strain, of the

Isles of Greece and kindred pieces. They have all his *vivida vis*, but seem to be of a lower and louder kind of poetry, with its own rights, no doubt ; but they suffer at once when confronted with the sublimer note of Shelley in *his* mood of patriot or humanitarian ardour :

The world's great age begins anew,
The golden years return :

Of that ineffable or transcendental note Byron can claim little. But for all that he has a " song his very own."

3. My third question, which is partly the same as the second, is this : *What has Byron to say to our sense of beauty?* What kind of feeling has he for beauty—visible beauty—and how far does he manage to get it into his language ? Here we are embarrassed by the fact that he came to be more and more ashamed of his feeling, and that it is part of his method, latterly, to interrupt in a brutal way his expression of it. He pours out mockeries and vulgarities and squalors and anticlimaxes in the same breath, when he is describing something or somebody lovely. Here, no doubt, he is true to himself, and it is all part of his method ; but we need not feel that we are sentimental if we are sometimes indignant. It is as though Byron could not fix his gaze for long at a time on what is well and fair. One of the old-fashioned reviewers put this point when he remarked that Byron aims " at what we must term the *suicidal success* of extinguishing in laughter the refined emotions he had raised." I shall not give examples, which are on every page. But we must not count amongst these interruptions such gay, human, and corrective passages as temper the idyll of Juan and Haidee. That, surely, in point of clean plastic beauty and harmonious execution, is still Byron's masterpiece. I do not understand, after reading it again, why some good critics deny to Byron any quality of greatness. Here he is simple, natural, and sincere ; the bathing, the handmaid cooking the eggs and coffee, the young sculptured figures who live in the moment—all this is as well done, I dare to say, in verse as that other idyll of Richard Feverel and Lucy is done in prose ;—in a prose which, as has more than once been said, is crying out to become verse. Byron's feeling for external beauty is doubtless not of the subtlest, but it is strong. Nothing is intimate, unearthly, speculative ; little is left to the imagination ; he sets to work our realising faculty, and makes us see, not dream. I will not quote the description of the couple wandering " over the shining

pebbles and the shells," it is too familiar ; and so is the picture of the sleepers in the harem. Less known is that of the English mansion, "Norman Abbey," in the thirteenth canto of *Don Juan* :

It stood embosom'd in a happy valley,
Crown'd by high woodlands, where the Druid oak
Stood, like Caractacus, in act to rally
His host, with broad arms gainst the thunderstroke,
And from beneath his boughs were seen to sally
The dappled foresters ; as day awoke,
The branching stag swept down with all his herd,
To quaff a brook which murmur'd like a bird.

Before the mansion lay a lucid Lake,
Broad as transparent, deep, and freshly fed
By a river, which its soften'd way did take
In currents by the calmer water spread
Around : the wildfowl nestled in the brake
And sedges, brooding in their liquid bed :
The woods sloped downwards to its brink, and stood
With their green faces fix'd upon the flood. . . .

Any one can pick holes in this ; would Tennyson have allowed the jingle *Caractacus . . . act ? Or did take ?* No, he would not. But stand a little way back, and the broad, free composition tells, and the effect is beautiful. Byron's plastic sense was not, we may think, originally strong ; but his wanderings among the galleries of painting and sculpture, which he describes so rhetorically in *Childe Harold*, may well have sharpened that sense.

4. But what of his instinct for beauty and harmony in *language* ? We have been told for fifty years what a sinner he is in this respect ; and we all know how bad he can be, and how bad he seems to wish to be. No one to-day, perhaps, cares much for the breathless iteration of pseudo-passionate matter which charmed the first readers of his lays. But let us take Byron when we know that he is in earnest—at least for the moment—and where no irony can intrude. It may seem strange to compare him with Wordsworth, whom he both mocked at and venerated. But sometimes he commands a clear and pure fount of diction, one or two degrees above grave prose, which is curiously like Wordsworth's diction of that order. Byron could often inspire his words with beauty when his feeling itself ran clear and pure. I find this diction in *The Dream*. Here he imagines, or remembers, how in the hour of his wedding to Miss Milbanke he found himself thinking of Mary Chaworth. The lines will be known here in Nottingham, and to this audience, better than anywhere else ; but I quote a few of them to bear out my suggestion

that in diction they are Wordsworthian ; whether consciously or not, is another matter :

And he stood calm and quiet, and he spoke
The fitting vows, but heard not his own words,
And all things reel'd around him ; he could see
Not that which was, nor that which should have been—
But the old mansion, and the accustom'd hall,
And the remember'd chambers, and the place,
The day, the hour, the sunshine, and the shade ;
All things pertaining to that place and hour,
And her who was his destiny,—came back
And thrust themselves between him and the light :
What business had they there at such a time ?

The last line, as poetry, is audacious ; but I think it stands, and clinches the whole. Byron's blank verse has been so much and so justly raked and scarified that we welcome this level musical strain, caught in a happy moment when his ear and his heart were honest.

5. But if we enlarge our question regarding beauty, and ask whether Byron can also give us grandeur of language, or what in his age was still called the Sublime, we must go carefully. This quality we should expect to find, if anywhere, in the *Cain* which Goethe admired so highly. And a certain grandeur of conception in that poem it would be hard to deny. Byron himself, in the person of Cain, is reasoning passionately, with unfettered brain, on life and death and divine responsibility. If they are not original reasonings, but old familiar eighteenth-century ones, the poet, with a freedom and fierceness as of the sea-eagle, makes them his own. Still, there is very little realised grandeur of expression. It is just in *Cain* that his sins of diction and metre swarm most abundantly. Continually, the eagle comes to earth, and walks, or hops, and is absurd. After Milton, you can hardly read *Cain*. Not that Byron is lacking in the sublime of a certain order. It comes in unexpected places, no doubt. Once again Goethe may be quoted. Talking to Crabb Robinson, as they read over the *Vision of Judgment* together, Goethe picked out certain stanzas for especial praise, and one, he said, was "sublime." At any rate it shows Byron's nearest to that quality, and it wins its effect and relief by being set between two purely satiric stanzas. The first of these, preceding the "sublime" one, introduces George the Third arriving at Heaven-Gate :

While thus they spake, the angelic caravan,
Arriving like a rush of mighty wind,
Cleaving the fields of space, as doth the swan
Some silver stream (say Ganges, Nile, or Inde,

Or Thames, or Tweed), and 'midst them an old man
 With an old soul, and both extremely blind,
 Halted before the gate, and in his shroud
 Seated their fellow-traveller on a cloud.

Then comes Milton's arch-rebel :

But bringing up the rear of this bright host
 A Spirit of a different aspect waved
 His wings, like thunderclouds above some coast
 Whose barren beach with frequent wrecks is paved ;
 His brow was like the deep when tempest-toss'd ;
 Fierce and unfathomable thoughts engraved
 Eternal wrath on his immortal face,
 And *where* he gazed a gloom pervaded space.

It is certainly magnificent ; and if Satan is here rather too like the familiar Byronic hero, it is just because that unsatisfactory personage, in his origins, goes back, through a mass of forgotten stories—the so-called "fiction of terror"—to whom but to Milton's Satan ?

6. But the *Vision of Judgment* suggests a last question, and a serious one, which takes us out of the confines of poetry, into the region where prose and poetry meet ; and it is this : *What can Byron do to amuse us ?* Amuse, that is either grimly or lightly, over the whole range, from high satire down to facetious high spirits ? Nothing, we know, is so precarious, or wears out so easily, as the wit and satire of a given age. How much, in this line, of Shakespeare, of Swift, of Dickens, has become, to speak honestly, impossible to laugh at totally ! I have a private belief that as humorists Fielding and Goldsmith stand almost undimmed ; but let that pass. There is plenty in Byron that makes us echo the famed words of Queen Victoria when she was told a certain story. We have to pass over a good deal of mere horseplay, blunt farce, blunter innuendo, and what may be called a prolonged sniggering over the obvious. Byron is amused ; we are not. He remained young after all, and on a certain side he never quite grew up. But then, we discount this fact, we know all about it, and all about Byron's streak of commonness, and no more need be said on that score. He remains, I think, when all is said, a true wit, and, using the term in its bolder not its finer sense, a true humorist. We should all agree that his general progress as a poet, leaving out his first essays, was from romance and declamation to satire and portraiture. Romance, indeed, remains to the last, and blends with satire into a most singular flashing web ; but satire, after all,

comes to rule. Now the principle of satire is reason, reason commenting mockingly upon absurd or base realities. Its natural medium is prose ; but it invests itself, by right, in verse instead, whenever the gaiety of the mocker sings itself into a tune, and demands the cymbals, or when the wrath of the moralist demands a louder blast for accompaniment. Byron, as we know, used both prose and verse. When he was young, they thought that he would be an orator ; and he says himself that as a schoolboy " my qualities were much more oratorical than poetical " ; and oratory, we know, is own brother to satire and invective. There is wit, I think, even in Byron's young speeches in the House of Lords ; when, for instance, he pleads for the removal of oppression from the Irish Catholics, and, pointing out that even the negroes had been set free, exclaims, " I pity the Catholic peasantry for not having had the good fortune to be born black." I do not dwell on the *English Bards*, of which he was afterwards ashamed, the satire having fallen wildly on many innocent heads. It is Pope, or Crabbe, blunted and coarsened. But it is worth noting that *Childe Harold* itself, but for the timid dissuasion of friends, might have been something of a medley of jest and earnest, like *Don Juan* later. The suppressed stanzas have been saved ; and there is the satire on the mock inquiry into the conduct of the generals after the Convention of Cintra :

Thus unto Heav'n appeal'd the people ; Heaven,
Which loves the lieges of our gracious king,
Decreed, that ere our Generals were forgiven,
Inquiry should be held about the thing.
But Mercy cloak'd the babes beneath her wing ;
And as they spar'd our foes, so spar'd we them ;
(Where was the pity of our sires for Byng ?)
Yet knaves, not idiots, should the law condemn ;
Then live, ye gallant knights ! and bless your judges' phlegm.

More of this ingredient would have lightened the tension of *Childe Harold* ; but when Byron got to Venice, and had purged his bosom of his hectic tales and of some of his confessions, he found his real vein and his real form, or mould, and he commenced humorist. The true accompaniment to *Don Juan* and *Beppo* are Byron's letters of the period. It seems to be admitted that his prose, which is chiefly found in his letters, will live ; and it will live by its rich, rough, rapid, spontaneous humour, as well as by its manliness. He is perfectly natural and untrammelled in his pictures of his various Venetian establishments, and afterwards in the tale of his dealings

with the Countess Guiccioli. There is very little romance or sentiment in the matter ; much more of a cool, careless intelligence and reckless humour. He becomes a positive, anti-sentimental Italian. Stendhal, an excellent witness, who met Byron, remarked on his freedom from the childish vanity of " turning a phrase." " He was exactly the reverse," says Stendhal, " of an academician ; his thoughts flowed with greater rapidity than his words, and were free from all affectation or studied grace." And this, too, is the charm of his satires ; you do not know, nor does he, what will come next ; except that the jest will never be far off. It is very odd that amidst these brilliant achievements, he went on writing his duller dramas, the *Sardanapalus* and *Werners*, of which I need only say that he meant them as a tribute to the classic proprieties and unities, which in his naïf way he thought were still respectable. He sacrificed to the goddess of beauty, the goddess of dullness, and the muse of comedy, all at once.

All three, no doubt, received their offering in *Don Juan* ; dullness is not absent, especially in the more roughly jeering portions ; much of it now reads cheap enough. But beauty, as I have said, is there ; and comedy, or satire, prevails. Lord Beaconsfield, in 1875, pitching his words, as his fashion was, rather high, remarked that "*Don Juan* will remain, as it is now recognised, an unexampled picture of human nature, and the triumph of the English language." Lord Beaconsfield, with his un-English mind, his vein of not wholly false romance, and his genius as a fellow-satirist, is another good witness. True, he could hardly have said more of Shakespeare's best comedies. But an *unexampled* picture, speaking literally, *Don Juan* is. Allow for all the blemishes, and there remains a surprising overplus of wit, observation, and also of a certain not contemptible kind of pathos. His hero is a peg for the adventures, which are mostly amorous ; as for the impropriety, I will for the last time quote Goethe, who said that " poets and romancers, bad as they may be, have not yet learned to be more pernicious than the daily newspapers which lie on every table." It may be added that the amorous scenes, though they do not satisfy and clear the imagination like Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, do not, for adult readers, either baulk and chill the imagination, or merely heat it. Juan, moreover, apart from these affairs, and even whilst he is in the thick of them, is made, very skilfully, to retain our regard. He is brave and humane, and there is no cruelty or " bilking " in his composition ; and, except in the bad

episode, where he is a half-reluctant party, with Catherine of Russia, he retains many traces of honour. ("In royalty's vast arms he sigh'd for beauty.") The spirit, however, of gaiety and irony that pervades the whole work, though it might at first seem to make matters worse, is really the solvent and antidote. There is, once more, that curious fundamental coolness and freedom of mind, and that dominance of reason, which emerges from Byron's torments, mysteries, posings, and more or less factitious confessions of wickedness and weakness. As a painter of manners, who leaves a true document behind him, his position seems to be safe. The Near East, and the London of the Regency—these are his two great hunting-grounds; and the latter cantos of *Don Juan* are a real addition to the memoirs of Regency England. Again we go back to the previous century for our comparisons. The real parallel to these scenes and persons, and to Byron's letters, is to be found not in the literature of romance at all, but in the letters and records of the serene, imperturbable old patrician free-living wits of the middle and later eighteenth century. Such are George Selwyn, and "Gilly" Williams, and that old Marquis of Queensberry who is not so bad as he has been painted. And Byron's strong, natural prose, as he pours out his stories and memories, is in essence *their* prose; it is not that of the age or set of Keats, and Leigh Hunt, and Wordsworth and Shelley. It is penetrated throughout with a masculine humour, coarse no doubt in fibre, but not in the least feeble or insidious or precious. And the same tone, the same diction, reign in his verse, in the pliable octave measure, which wavers and changes with every mood and gust. Why, you hear the gay light old verse of the last age even in the *Hours of Idleness* :

Why should you weep like Lydia Languish
And fret with self-created anguish?
Or doom the lover you have chosen
On winter nights to sigh half-frozen;
In leafless shades to sue for pardon,
Only because the scene's a garden?

I will add, that if we are asking what Byron can give us to-day, and to what gap in contemporary poetry his performance points, one reply will be, that we have had no new *Don Juan*. We have no great satirist in verse; the art seems to be lost. We have nobody with a large, free, gay, unflinching knowledge of the world, and with the ability to express that knowledge in verse. Allowing for the vast and obvious differences, Byron, at the opening of the nineteenth

century, occupies a position not wholly unlike that of Swift at the opening of the eighteenth. Have we a Swift? We have, in prose, Bernard Shaw; but I will not dwell on the difference in power, or on Swift's vastly sounder humanity. We certainly have had no Byron. In one sense, in the sense in which Flaubert said, "Tous les époques sont atroces," every age is fodder for the satirist. In another sense, our own age seems especially vulnerable. But the paralysis of great literary art which has been caused by the world-convulsion, and which seems to have inhibited the largest kinds of poetry, has also left poetic satire comparatively mute. Moreover, if we look far back, do we find any English satire in rhyme that approaches *Don Juan*, if we reckon quality, variety, and mass all together? The *Dunciad* shows great power; but who except a student can read it for amusement? *Absalom and Achitophel* is a great and finished production, but it is only of the middle length.

In trying to sketch an answer to a few leading questions I have naturally left a great deal out. Nothing has been said of the Byron who went to Greece, who upheld the freedom of little nations, and who exclaimed that "the peoples will conquer in the end." Nor has anything been said of his sufferings or of their problematical causes. People will always make books about Byron, as they do about Hamlet; for it is the man that tells us most about himself, who remains the most mysterious. These are only stray notes on Byron's art and genius; they are an effort to intimate what he still can say to us when all mere enthusiasm, and all mere revulsion, have cleared themselves away.

SHAKESPEARE AND SIR THOMAS MORE

By LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING (Breslau)

THE book on *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More** has found so much favour with experts and the general public alike that it may almost appear impossible to invalidate the arguments piled up in it by some of the greatest authorities living for Shakespeare's authorship of the so-called "insurrection-scene." Still it will not perhaps be useless to show that there are some points of view from which the interesting building erected in this book looks less weather-proof than it appears if looked at with the eyes of the architects. For reasons which are not far to seek, the question of the identity of the pen which wrote the sheets concerned, with that from which the six signatures originated, must be ruled out in this investigation. However, it cannot be left unsaid, that these chapters too contain some material that is far from convincing to the unprejudiced reader. When Sir E. Maunde Thompson states the extraordinary similarity of the *a* in signature No. 1 to certain *a*'s in the manuscript (especially the "pointed projection or spur from the lower end of the back of the letter"), he will certainly not be contradicted, but it cannot be overlooked, on the other hand, that the two letters *h* and *s* are in all cases hopelessly and absolutely dissimilar in signatures and manuscript. (The reproduction of the *h* of signature No. 5 on plate v does not by any means give a right impression, as is easily to be seen on plate i. A little better is the *h* of signature No. 1, but in reality—as plate i shows—this letter too appears different in the facsimile, it being much more pointed and showing almost an acute angle; also, if less so, the *h* of No. 2, whereas the *h*'s of the manuscript are remarkable for their curves.) The difference between the *s*'s needs no

* *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More: papers by A. W. Pollard, W. W. Greg, E. Maunde Thompson, J. Dover Wilson, and R. W. Chambers.* Cambridge University Press, 1923. ("Shakespeare Problems by A. W. Pollard and J. Dover Wilson," II.)

pointing out; it is striking. Then there are the two words of the last signature of the will: "*By me*," which contain a capital *B* which is so thoroughly unlike the capital *B*'s in the manuscript, that one is at a loss to understand how they should be written by the same hand. On the whole one gets the impression from the signatures that Shakespeare's handwriting was a good deal more angular than that of the manuscript, which is characterised by its curves. But be that as it may, the decisive tests will in any case have to be looked for in other fields.

§ 1. THE SUPPOSED SHAKESPEARIAN FLAVOUR

The whole controversy takes its origin from the impression that *Sir Thomas More* contains scenes (or at least one scene) that are worthy of Shakespeare's authorship. It depends, as Simpson (*Notes and Queries*, July 1, 1871) says, "on the Shakespearian flavour, which only a critical taste can thoroughly discriminate." A number of distinguished scholars have tried to characterise, define, and dissect this flavour and to find out its components. These consist, to quote Simpson again, as well in "the imagery as the morality of these lines." The imagery and the style show, on the one hand, what R. W. Chambers calls "repetitions" from Shakespeare's acknowledged works, on the other hand they have, to quote A. W. Ward, "the true Shakespearian manner." Moreover, the ideas expressed in these lines, particularly the political ideas, are exactly what we should expect from him. As regards the first of these arguments, it is certainly not to be denied that there are many things in the insurrection-scene which suggest Shakespearian passages. But it is scarcely worth while to discuss the degree of relationship between passages like "sit as kings in your desires" and "entitled in thy parts do crowned sit," Sonn. 37 (Simpson, Chambers), or "you in the ruff of your opinions clothed" and "dressed in a little brief authority" (Longworth, Chambers, *Times Lit. Supp.*, December 20, 1923), considering that there are plays by other Elizabethans, e.g. by Heywood—it will be seen later on that he is not mentioned without purpose—which although abounding with unmistakable Shakespearian reminiscences nobody ascribes to Shakespeare.* Of real importance, therefore, are those

* E. Koeppel's collections in *Studien über Shakespeare's Wirkung auf zeitgenössische Dramatiker* (W. Bang's "Materialien z. Kunde des älteren Engl. Dramas," Bd. IX, p. 11 seq.) might be easily extended.

"repetitions" only which are to be found in Shakespearian plays of undisputedly later origin and which do not obviously belong to a common stock of Elizabethan play-wrights' phrases. Now of these there are evidently not many that deserve serious consideration (for a number of them lose their force if the play—as I shall try to prove later on—is to be dated after *Julius Cæsar* and *Hamlet*). R. W. Chambers has shown some similar expressions, it is true, that occur in *Coriolanus*. He lays particular stress on the repetition of the idea that civil war would lead to a chaos, in which in the end people "*would feed on one another*." But after all, is this idea more than a truism, which may have existed in the thinking of many contemporaries in those unruly times and been usually couched in the same words, although by chance other examples of it are now wanting? * I cannot find, furthermore, that the "greyhound" simile offers much better material. Nay, it seems to me that R. W. Chambers misinterprets the passage. Of Titus Lartius (*Coriol.* I, vi, 37) it is said that he holds—

*Corioli in the name of Rome
Even like a fawning greyhound in the leash,
To let him slip at will.*

Corioli, the unfortunate conquered town which is at the mercy of the victor, is compared to a "fawning greyhound," which the owner will let loose from the fettering string just when he likes. But the rebels in *Sir Thomas More* are said, by assuming the right to punish the strangers, to—

*lead the majesty of law in lion
To slip him like a hound;*

i.e. they usurp the prerogative of the (law of the) state and employ (its) force as they like. Here the "hound" is the power they use against the strangers. The image then is totally dissimilar. So the picture at the back of the writer's mind is much more similar to passages like *Jul. Cæs.* III, i, 273: "Cry havoc and let slip the dogs of war."

Superficial likenesses such as these have little convincing power. The decisive test as to the imagery employed is, whether it bears the particularly Shakespearian mark. Now the characteristic

* An instructive parallel is offered by the frequency of occurrence of the "hydra-headed multitude," see Fr. Tupper, junr., *The Shakespearian Mob* (Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc. Am." xxvii), 495.

traits of Shakespeare's style are the newness and boldness of his similes, the acuteness of the observation they betray, the persuasive power of his almost paradoxical combination of things, the surprising riches of his associations. For his imagination, as Spalding says, throws constantly flowers into the currency of his thought. Lines like those from *Coriolanus*, I, i, 168 :

you dissentionous rogues
That, rubbing the poor itch of your
opinion,
Make yourselves scabs ;

or 2 *Hen. IV*, IV, iv, 33 :

being incensed, he's flint,
As humorous as winter, and as sudden
As flaws congealed in the spring of day ;

are therefore unmistakably Shakespearian ; they would betray his hand wherever they were to be found. Are there any lines of this sort in the "insurrection-scene" ? Certainly not. Its language is throughout clever but nowhere brilliant. This is what Furnivall must have had in his mind's eye when he wrote that there is "nothing necessarily Shakespearian in it, though part of it (is) worthy of him." Perhaps, however, even this is too much to allow. There are, at any rate, lines in the scene that have scarcely the Shakespearian ring, compare for instance a poor verse like :

Youle put downe straingers,
Kill them, cutt their throts . . . !

or :

Those same hands
That you like rebels lift against the
peace
Lift up for peace !

In one case, the reviser himself seems to have been so little satisfied with the text that he crossed a passage out, and indeed : "to kneele to be forgyven is safer warrs, then ever you can make, whose discipline is ryot" deserved no better fate, the paradox "to kneele . . . is warrs" being most unhappily chosen.

There are certainly, and this has more weight, a great number of expressions in it which seem not at all to belong to his vocabulary. It is true that this test must be used with great caution. For it is self-evident that each part of his work must contain words which are not in the rest. On the other hand, there are certainly words and expressions which belong to the common property of the time, and are lacking in Shakespeare's vocabulary for the simple psychological reason that every human being, even he with the very greatest imagination, has only a distinctly circumscribed stock of words in his use, favouring some and neglecting

others. Looked at from this standpoint, it appears remarkable that the following words and phrases from the insurrection-scene should not be found in Shakespeare's works :

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. red herring. | 8. true as the gospel. |
| 2. Harry groat. | 9. set up a supposition. |
| 3. troy weight. | 10. forwarn of. |
| 4. to stand in a question. | 11. it were no error, if. |
| 5. shrevaltry. | 12. appropriate. |
| 6. to chide down. | 13. momtanish. |
| 7. transportacion. | 14. inhumanitie. |

15. As regards "*sorry parsnip*," it is to be noted that Shakespeare *never* uses "sorry" in the sense of "*worthless*." Although his work contains eighty-nine cases of "sorry," it has this meaning in no other passage.

16. The expression "command them *to a stillness*" is decidedly unShakespearean. "Stillness" occurs many times in Shakespeare's work, but its meaning is never a merely negative one, = the cessation or absence of noise, but a characteristic attribute or state, sometimes of the mind. Compare: The gravity and stillness of your youth, *Oth.* II, iii, 196, similarly *Hen. V.* III, i, 4; A wilful stillness entertain, *M. of V.* I, i, 90; in patient stillness, *Hen. V.* III, vii, 24; Soft stillness and the night become the touches of sweet harmony, *M. of V.* v, i, 56.

17. "*topt the peace*" is quite without parallel in Shakespeare.

18. "*in ruff of your opinions*." "Ruff" occurs five times in Shakespeare, but always in the sense of "collars" or "ruffles of boots," not once in the sense of "highest pitch or fullest degree of some exalted condition" or "exalted or elated state" which the *Oxford Dict.* calls "very common from c. 1570 to 1675."

19. "*shark on you*." As the verb "to shark" occurs for the two first times here and in *Hamlet*, R. W. Chambers quotes it to sustain the thesis of Shakespeare's authorship. But do not the facts rather point to the contrary? For "to shark" in *Hamlet* means "gather," whereas here it means something like "to rob."

20. "*as mutinies are incident*." According to Chambers's *Twentieth Cent. Dict.* the adj. "incident" has the two principal meanings: (1) "naturally belonging to anything or following therefrom"; (2) "liable to occur." In the first sense it occurs

three times in Shakespeare's works, in the second in *Sir Thomas More*, but not in Shakespeare.

21. As to habits of style, it is impossible to overlook the fondness of the author of the insurrection-scene for interrupting himself with a short sentence, commencing with "as." This we find no less than *three times* in the comparatively short passage :

v, 18. These basterds of dung, as you knowe they growe in dung, have infected us.

v, 130. What rebell captaine, as mutinies are incident, by his name can still the rout ?

v, 137. Say nowe the King (as he is clement, yf th' offendor moorne) should so much com . . .

I do not find this habit in Shakespeare.

22. "*a made my Brother Arther Watchins Seriant Safes yeoman.*" The name "*Sergeant Safe*" does not sound Shakespearian. E. Erler's collection, *Die Namengebung bei Shakespeare* (Schücking's *Anglistische Arbeiten*, No. 2), Heidelberg, 1913, shows that Shakespeare for his significant names preferred objects which are characteristic for the name-bearers' vocation, as : Weaver Bottom, Musician Soundpost, Cook Potpan, constables Fang and Snare, or he calls a schoolmaster Pinch ; sometimes, too, the comical names lack the association of this sort : constables Oatcake and Seacole. If he chooses simple adjectives, they help to characterise the bearer in a witty way : recruits Feeble and Mouldy, parson Dumbe ; Slender, Simple, Justice Shallow ; a hostess is called Mrs. Quickly, presumably from the shout of the impatient guests. But we look in vain in his works for a soldier Valiant or a parson Pious. There is too little wit in a "*Sergeant Safe*" for Shakespeare.

§ 2. "SHAKESPEARIAN IN FEELING" ?

So great an authority on the English drama as Professor A. W. Ward has summed up his opinion on the *Thomas Moore* scenes in question, that it is "genuinely Shakespearian in feeling (and) it is with difficulty (it) can be conceived to have been written by any other contemporary author." This conception has been endorsed by the authors of *Shakespeare's Hand*, etc. In order to gain a critical standpoint for this high appreciation it is necessary to sketch out the trend of ideas in More's great speech first.

The rebellion is looked at by More from—in the main—three points of view: (1) Practical wisdom (consider the consequences of your action!); (2) religion (you offend against God's law!); and (3) humanity ("let us do as we may be done by"). But it is very curious that between the second and the third thought the writer throws in some considerations which in reality belong to the first point of view. The idea of v, 114 *seq.*: "what rebel captain—as mutinies are incident—by his name can still the rout? Who will obey a traitor?" has already been expressed before in other words, or at least its legitimate position would be after the lines 82 *seq.*: "by this pattern not one of you should live an aged man," for they only continue or vary the train of thought which initiates the whole speech. I do not mean to say, of course, that these lines (114 *seq.*) have been actually misplaced; I only draw attention to the fact that the writer is by no means a man of very clear conception.

But he is very far, also, from possessing Shakespeare's marvellous insight into the motives of human action. There can be little doubt that the effect of a speech like Sir Thomas More's in this scene would in reality have been very different from that depicted by the dramatist. For two reasons. Firstly, the crowd would have been right in answering him that he entirely misconstrues their case. For if they really would have to leave England and would have to implore the mercy of the people in "Fraunc or Flanders, any Jarman province, Spane or Portigall," their situation would be absolutely different from that of the proud and overbearing foreigners, whose impudent attitude towards the natives of London has—as the first scenes of the play show—become simply unbearable. What the rebels object to is not that strangers are treated humanely, but that they themselves must endure to be treated by them like dogs. But even if the rhetorical power of the orator was able to make them forget this difference, they would scarcely be moved by the argument which is here couched in the words "letts do as we may be doon by." Experience teaches us that in times of public excitement no argument has less force with the masses than this one. Did Shakespeare take a different view about the psychology of the multitude? The facts point to the contrary. What is the way of Clifford (in 2 *Hen. VI*, iv, vii, 34 *seq.*) to win over the masses to him, which have been seduced by Jack Cade? He appeals to their patriotism, to-day we should say, to their chauvinism, in egging them on against France. Like a

modern jingo agitator he conjures up the picture of the threatening triumph of their national adversaries in order to silence the "class-war":

Were't not a shame, that whilst you live at jar,
The fearful French, whom you late vanquished,
Should make a start o'er seas and vanquish you?
Methinks already in this civil broil
I see them lording it in London streets . . . etc.

This is a splendid piece of mass-psychology. Is it necessary to refer to a still more glorious example of it, the Marc-Antony scene in *Julius Caesar*, with its brilliant mixture of rhetorical means? Frederick Tupper, junr., who has given an elaborate analysis of them, explains the effects of this great speech with the very words, that "Antony fires the multitude not by working upon its reason, its critical spirit" for "a mob can make no response to reason and conscience, and higher motives are above the understanding of an entranced multitude" (*l.c.* 506, 507). *That is exactly what the author of the insurrection-scene in Sir Thomas More fails to see.* The idea would probably have appeared child-like to a man of Shakespeare's realism, to make the mob-rebels (it says: "all," not a single person!) after the appeal to their reason and conscience exclaim: "fayth a saies trewe letts do as we may be doon by." To write this a more sentimental mind than Shakespeare's is required. And indeed there is a slight strain of sentimentality in the whole of the speech. Compare the lines:

Ymagin that you see the wretched straingers,
Their babyes at their backes and their poor lugage,
Plodding tooth ports and costes for transportacion.

Here again the case is misconstrued in a characteristic way. The proud and "saucie aliens," whom we have just been witnessing behaving in an outrageous way to the good citizens of London and to their wives, become suddenly a pitiable lot of distressed people, the impudent "libertins" who enticed the citizens' wives away from their husbands and later on had the insolence of charging the husbands the costs for their "boarding," or tried to get hold of pretty women by employment of force in the street, have turned into hard-struggling, grief-bowed, injured fathers of families who are particularly worthy of commiseration because of their "poor luggage" and the little children, whom they bear on their backs as the dearest possessions, as the wives of Weinsberg whilom did

their husbands. If this be not a sentimental conception of things, I wonder what sentimentality consists of.

Perhaps the objection will be raised that Shakespeare often heightens the effect of pathetic passages by the mentioning of children. This, however, is only partially true. Babies occur, where the plot requires them, as in *C. o. E.*, *Winter's T.*, *Rich. III.*, *Macbeth*, and elsewhere, and are spoken of in sympathetic words. The murder of children—"flowering infants" as they are called in *Hen. V.*, III, iii, 14—is repeatedly spoken of as the height of terrors, pity being accordingly represented once as "a new-born babe striding the blast" (*Macb.* I, vii, 22). But in all this there is nothing particularly sentimental, certainly not in the description of the Roman citizens, who, to see Pompey, climbed up to "the chimney-tops, your infants in your arms." In contradistinction to this we *do* find, it is true, the "motif" of babies employed to delineate a situation that is "larmoyante," viz. in I *Hen. VI.* I, i, 49 :

await for wretched years
When at their mother's moist'n'd eyes babies shall suck, etc.

and I *Hen. VI.* III, iii, 48 :

As looks the mother on her lowly babe. . . .

But it is interesting to see that both passages belong to an evidently non-Shakespearian part of the trilogy ! *

But this is not the only portion of the speech that breathes another atmosphere than Shakespeare's world. The different atmosphere makes itself felt, also, when the speaker admonishes the rebels :

Wash your foule mynds with tears, and those same handes
That, etc.

Would Shakespeare have made an orator ask a seditious crowd to commence a general whining by shedding tears of compunction in public? This too, as will be shown later on, is more like Heywood than like Shakespeare.

There is also something distinctly unShakespearian in the use of the term "*inhumanitie*," which corresponds with this difference. It has been stated above that the word "*inhumanitie*" does not

* For *Hen. VI.* see Else von Schaubert, *Drayton's Anteil an Heinrich VI.*, 2 u. 3 Teil (Schücking und Deutschbeins Neue Anglistische Arbeiten, No. 4), Cöthen, 1920, a book that has not perhaps received the attention which it deserves.

occur at all in Shakespeare (No. 14 on page 44). This might be mere chance, for the adjective "*inhuman*" does occur. But there is a distinct difference between its meaning and the modern sense of the word, the same difference that exists between German "*unmenschlich*" and "*entmenscht*." It is the second meaning that is represented by the word in Shakespeare's language, something like "totally divested of any human feeling." It is therefore not used very often. In *Tit. Andr.* (v, ii, 177) it characterises the murderers and ravishers of Lavinia, in 3 *Hen. VI* the fury Margaret ("more inhuman, more inexorable, ten times more than tigers of Hyrcania"), in *Rich. III* it is applied by Anne to the murder of her husband (1, ii, 60), Henry V calls so the men who intend to kill the holy person of the King, the dying Roderigo finds no stronger expression for the moral monster Iago, Bertram deserves it, whom the King in *All's Well* considers as the murderer of his own loving wife, Shylock is termed "*inhuman*," who thirsts for the blood of his innocent adversary. In all cases, then, it designates the highest degree of moral depravity, almost always assassins. Would Shakespeare use it to characterise the action of poor people, who lose their heads and turn in exasperation and rage against their foreign oppressors?

§ 3. THE POSITION OF THE PLAY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DRAMA

A reader of the play who has been patient enough to lend his ear to the arguments brought forth until here will perhaps object that no matter if what Sir Thomas More says to the multitude appears sentimental or unsentimental, convincing or not, the author will have found it in his literary source. Just the contrary, however, is the case. The whole speech is an invention. Hall, whose description of "*Evil Mayday*" the play uses, mentions nothing of the sort. His report only contains a statement that Sir Thomas More and others entreated the masses "and had almost brought them to a staye," but the violence was renewed and they did not succeed. *How then did the idea of a great oration which had a marvellous effect on the multitude enter the authors' mind?* This question is only part of a greater problem: the general attitude of the authors to the sources. To find a key to this, however, the question must first be answered: How did the idea to write a drama on Sir Thomas More

originate at all? This question could scarcely be answered by those who like Simpson and others dated the play 1586 or 1587, *i.e.* at a time when the English Chronicle play was of absolutely different character. On trying to ascertain the position of Sir Thomas More, one's first endeavour, then, must be to find out the group to which it belongs. Now there can be little doubt that it forms part of a group which shows in some respects a surprising similarity. These are *The First Part of Sir John Oldcastle* (1600) and *The True Chronicle History of the whole Life and Death of Thomas Lord Cromwell* (1602). Oldcastle is usually looked upon as the result of a more or less ineffectual endeavour to challenge Shakespeare. Ineffectual the play indeed is, if compared with Shakespeare's art. But one must not overlook that it is a comparatively modern idea to make a man like Oldcastle the hero of a play. Not in the sense that he is not a king or a royal personage. Sir Thomas Stukeley, too, is not of royal blood. But to select him for the leading figure of a play was to create a hero-type hitherto almost unknown in Elizabethan drama, a man who was not "a dramatic character" in the traditional sense at all. It is true that, before Oldcastle, dramatic art had occasionally celebrated men of note in civic affairs, but never before had so detailed a portrait been attempted of a man who had not earned any warlike laurels or made himself famous by daring adventures. Oldcastle held a place in the history of his country's civilisation which allowed the dramatist to hold up as an example one who was human, kindhearted, cheerful and trustworthy, charitable, self-controlled and devout, tender to his wife, for whose sake only his suffering weighs upon him, and above all a staunch adherent to principle as regards both his advanced religious creed and his loyalty to the King. When the two clash he unflinchingly decides for the first and tells the King so with great frankness, who, however, is far too generous to "incroach upon his conscience." The hero in *The Life and Death of Cromwell* is of course in many ways of a different stamp, still something of the spirit of Oldcastle is in him too. Schelling says (*The English Chronicle Play*, p. 217): "Cromwell stands for the glorification, the very apotheosis, of *citizen virtue*. It is his honorable thrift and capacity in trade, his temperance, piety, and staunch Protestantism, which are dwelt on and extolled. He befriends the broken debtor and outwits the wrongdoer. He is mindful of others' favours to him, forgetful of his own," etc. Another embodiment of

citizen virtue (with frequent reference to the surroundings where it grew from, *i.e.* the city of London) is Sir Thomas More. He has been carefully divested of those traits which might create antipathy against him with an Elizabethan audience, especially his strict catholicism, and some of those very qualities upon which stress was laid in Oldcastle and Cromwell are thrown into bold relief instead. A childlike cheerfulness and joviality combine with absolute self-control, kindness, and social feeling, with severity against himself. Although he is the most tender husband and father, still the love for his family does not influence his attitude where his conscience is concerned. For his character is tested like Oldcastle's in the adherence to his principles when they prove fatal to him. He makes in this way an extremely modern impression as a hero, nay, he reminds us of the very type of hero of Galsworthy's "Mob" in resisting the adjuration of his nearest relatives, even his wife, to desert his cause. There is a spirit of advanced humanity about him that pervades the whole play and makes itself particularly felt in the description of the treatment of the Mayday revolt by the authorities, which shows a deviation from the very different and unpleasant statement of the historical sources looking almost like a distinct tendency.

But the similarity between these plays does not confine itself to such more general and—most critics will say—vague likenesses. Especially *Cromwell* and *More* show a near relation. They both of them to a great extent want the unity of action. Individual careers are represented in a series of scenes of sometimes anecdotal character. Occasionally the matter used for the one play is taken from the very source of the other, as the episode of the long-haired Faulkner in *More*, which is related in Fox in connection with Thomas Cromwell (Tucker Brooke, *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, liv). Striking single resemblances have been repeatedly drawn attention to (cf. Fleay, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 298; W. Streit's diss. p. 53 *seq.*; and the present writer in *Engl. Stud.* 46, p. 242). They might be multiplied.* But the most important point has never been noticed. As Fleay rightly remarks: "In Act iv (of *Cromwell*) the chorus apologises for the omission of Wolsey's life. That had, in fact, been treated already by Chettle in August, 1601, and by Chettle,

* Compare, *e.g.*, *Cromwell*, III, iii, the endeavour to make the three great men, Wolsey, More, and Gardiner, appear in a brilliant "causerie," with the same attempt concerning More, Erasmus, and Surrey in *Sir Thomas More*, III, ii.

Munday, Drayton, and Smith in November, 1601, in two plays for the Admiral's men." There can be little doubt that that is the reason why, in the Cromwell play, the public is asked to "pardon if we omit all Wolsaye's life." *But it evidently is the reason, too, why "all Wolsaye's life" is omitted from Sir Thomas More. Nothing surely is more remarkable than the absolute absence of everything that concerns Cardinal Wolsey from our play.* Nay, more, not even is he absent, but Sir Thomas More has in some cases taken his very historical place. It was Wolsey who acted the decisive part in the liquidation of the "Ill-Mayday" revolt; it was *he*, not More, who scored the success to have the "good emperour," *i.e.* Kaiser Maximilian, "marche in pay Under our English flagge, and weare the crosse, Like some high order, on his manly breast" (iv, ii),* at a time when More was still under-sheriff of London. Moreover, how is it possible that More's dealings with Wolsey, whose direct successor as Chancellor he was, as they are offered in the sources are entirely disregarded in the play? The reason is obvious. These things must have been dealt with already in the very popular plays about Wolsey's life. The Wolsey theme had been worked out so fully that the interest in him with the public was supposed to be exhausted. That is also why names like Cromwell or Norfolk do not, as we might expect, appear in our play. A connection of this sort between *Cromwell*, *More*, and the Wolsey plays is also made plausible by their authorship. In the two Wolsey plays the lost *Life of Cardinal Wolsey* and its sequel, the *Rising of Cardinal Wolsey*, which is lost too, Chettle, Drayton, *Munday*, and Smith were concerned. Now the handwriting of "our best plotter" *Munday* seems to be established beyond doubt as that "of the bulk of *Sir Thomas More*" too (*Shakespeare's Hand*, etc., p. 8). This makes it more plausible still, that *Cromwell*, *Wolsey*, and *More* belong closely together. It may even be—though this is by no means certain—that of this close connection there is a hint in the very plays themselves. Says Gardiner in the *Cromwell* play (iv, v, 54):

Theres Thomas Wolsey, hees alreadie gone,
And Thomas Moore, he followed after him:
Another Thomas yet there doth remaine . . .

* The Emperor Maximilian and all his servants which were retained with the King of England in wages by the day, every person according to his degree, and the emperor as the King's soldier wore a cross of Saint George with a rose. Hall, fol. 32; cf. Holinshed, ii, 1483.

As we did not hear anything before about More's death in the play, this may refer to the More theme which was left to a play of its own, to follow suit. It had to be constructed, as far as political situations were concerned, from what was left after the political circumstances of the times of Wolsey had been dealt with already in the plays on Wolsey and Cromwell.

§ 4. THE DATE

If these conclusions are accepted, we get a firm date for our play. The Oldcastle plays by Munday, Drayton, Wilson, and Hathway date from 1599. The Wolsey plays, in which again Drayton and Munday were concerned, date from 1601. *Cromwell* used to be dated much earlier, but Streit already has made it plausible (*The Life and Death of Th. Lord Cromwell*, Jena, 1904) that it originated after Wolsey.* *Sir Thomas More* then must needs date from about the same time, 1601-2. That the play did not originate before that date I have formerly tried to show by a number of reminiscences which connect it with plays like *Julius Caesar* and *Hamlet* (*Engl. St.* 46, 233 seq.). I cannot allow that they have been invalidated by R. W. Chambers. Chambers admits (*l.c.* p. 145) that there is "a real connection" between the scene in *Julius Caesar* in which the masses are worked upon and won by Marc Antony and the similar scene in our play, but he explains it by assuming the authorship of Shakespeare in both cases. "We cannot argue," he says, "that, because Antony did actually, as a matter of history, succeed in swaying the mob by his speech, whilst the success of More is fictitious, therefore the More fiction is necessarily an imitation of that historic fact. If the writer of the More scene needed any pattern to follow, he could have found it in the speech in which old Clifford equally wins the rebels under Cade to his side." But how then does Chambers explain it, that the idea entered the mind of the man who made the plot of *Sir Thomas More*, to make the hero—contrary to all historical facts—from a comparatively unimportant position rise to a decisive one in the state by a miraculous rhetorical performance which alters the opinion of the masses and reverses the threatening current of public events? Chambers mentions the Clifford-Cade scene as a possible pattern.

* The idea to introduce a "motif of last tension" in making Cromwell's life depend on his reading a letter which is brought to him at the moment, which decides about his fate (v, ii), is possibly borrowed from *Julius Caesar*, III, i.

But the whole situation there is entirely different. The nineteen lines Clifford pronounces are *by no means the great "air de bravoure"* which is the climax of the play and decides about the orator's fate; they are, on the contrary, comparatively so unimportant that the King does not even feel compelled to say a word of thanks to him for them, let alone to promote him. It is true that the authors could find in their sources that More had showed himself of considerable eloquence in Parliament; still the idea of his creating a wave of enthusiasm by a public speech which bears him up to the highest dignities at once is strange to the facts. Imitation of *Julius Caesar* explains it best. But there are other reminiscences as well, which point to the same date. I cannot repeat here what I have tried to make clear (p. 236, *l.c.*) about the similarity between the actors' scene in *Hamlet* and the actors' scene in *Sir Thomas More*. I doubt if it is invalidated by Chambers' remark, that "if More's attitude to the players sometimes reminds us of Hamlet's, there is nothing more than can well be accounted for by the common atmosphere in which both plays grew up." Can a common atmosphere (?) produce parallel situations and attitudes of this sort? Another likeness has been left unmentioned up to now. It is to be found in *Sir Thomas More*, I, ii, where Justice Suresbie is let down by the cunning pick-pocket Lifter. The source (cf. Dyce, p. 13) only describes him as a "grave, old man," later on, "so bitter a censurer of innocent men's negligence." In the play he is a pompous person, loquacious, vain, jovial from a wrong feeling of superiority, inclined to vent a gaiety which is principally pleasedness with himself, endeavouring to be witty and thinking himself so, with a certain over-officiousness, which expresses itself in his language, for he repeats the same words two or three times: "Sirra, be breefe, be breef! . . . doo not, doo not, sirra. . . . There be, varlet! What be there? Tell me what there be. Come off or on: there be! what be there, knave? . . . Well . . . well . . . excellent, excellent . . . yfaith, yfaith. . . ."

There can be little doubt that this Justice Suresbie is the image of Justice Shallow in Shakespeare's 2 *Hen. IV*, even to his manner of speech (compare passages like III, ii, 96 *seq.*: "Where's the roll? where's the roll? where's the roll? Let me see, let me see, let me see. . . .") Now 2 *Hen. IV* was written 1598 or early in 1599 (R. P. Cowl, Arden Edition, 1923, p. xv). The figure of Justice Shallow became evidently soon famous, as is shown by a passage

in the *Return from Parnassus*, IV, v: "your face would be good for a foolish mayre or a foolish justice of peace" (cf. the present writer's *Shakespeare im literarischen Urteil seiner Zeit*, p. 168 ff.), which Fleay connects with the Thomas More scene (*Life and Work of Shakespeare*, p. 223). As it has been made plausible that *More* was never acted, this explanation seems to be impossible.

In proposing the above-mentioned date of 1601 or 1602 for the play I needs must give up the still later date (1604-5) which I proposed in *Engl. Stud.* 46, 228 seq. The arguments taken from general tendencies of the times must necessarily carry with them less weight than those drawn from special circumstances. Meanwhile one of the minor arguments for an early origin, the allusion to one "Oagle," has broken down (*Times Lit. Suppl.* November 8, 1923). It is to be doubted if the Goodal argument is of much greater value.

§ 5. THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE SCENE

According to the theory of A. W. Pollard and the other contributors to *Shakespeare's Hand*, the "players in anticipation of trouble with the censor had turned to" William Shakespeare, "who had previously had no part in the play" (p. 5), and he supplied the three pages in question. It is not easily to be seen why they acted so. Chambers supposes (p. 180) the difference between the original draft and the later text to have consisted in an alteration from a harsh "threat of present death" to an "appeal to generosity, fair play, pity." Did they believe to be in this way more in agreement with the censor's views? But whence this belief? They were, at any rate, mistaken, for the censor's rigorous prohibition of the scene shows that he lacked the taste for ethical subtleties of this sort. But it is of course more than doubtful if any such idea was implied. On the other hand, it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty that the speech in the original text "terrorised [the crowd] by the threat of present death." Chambers says that "references in the other scenes make [this] clear." As far as I can see, however, it is just the other way round. It is stated above already that the whole "Ill Mayday" scenes are pervaded by a spirit of humanity that is remarkably absent in the sources. One would, e.g., look in vain for an idea in them like II, iii, 34: "The King laments, if one true subject bleed." From the very beginning More is full of sympathy

and understanding for the "simple men" who mostly act from foolishness, not wickedness. What his original words must have been is, moreover, clearly pointed to by Doll's later remark: "Thou hast done more *with thy good words* than all they could with their weapons" (II, iv, 202). Threats one certainly would not call "*good words*." And wherever else his speech is mentioned, his "eloquence" (II, iv, 217) and his "persuasion" (III, i, 96) are being praised. That allows the conclusion that the tendency of the original speech—and perhaps the ideas too—were not very different from the later one. In all probability, then, this passage, like others in the play, was simply worked over on the old lines.* If it be objected that this revision may have been done by Shakespeare nevertheless, one wonders what the reasons may have been. Consideration for the censor does at any rate not appear plausible.

Moreover, if it were not for the handwriting, a great number of people would certainly not hesitate to ascribe also other parts of the play to Shakespeare. Simpson, who started the whole discussion, felt sure that Shakespeare was the author not of one scene only, and who will deny that the style of III, ii, 1-20 has indeed some resemblance to Shakespeare's? (Compare "I, in my father's life, To take prerogative and tithe of knees From elder kinsmen," etc. See *Engl. Stud.* 46, p. 238.) This makes it more probable still that it is wrong to stare spellbound at the handwriting. As regards other passages of the play, too, the authors of *Shakespeare's Hand* do not always identify handwriting and author. One ought to do so also in this case, *i.e.* not only in the "147 lines," but also in other passages to recognise a man who sometimes—although not very strongly—reminds us of Shakespeare. Who was it? What has been stated above about the close connection of this play with the Wolsey plays, and also the Oldcastle plays, makes it appear probable that some at least of the authors of these plays must have had a share in it. The claim of Munday seems to be settled. That Drayton co-operated is extremely likely, and some passages could

* It will be objected that the revision certainly cannot have been made by the original author, or somebody familiar with the details of the play, because the reviser knew so little of the *dramatis personæ* that he in several cases simply put "other" before the speeches and left it to the final redactor to put in the right name. But I am afraid we have made too much out of these occasional "others." On closer scrutiny one sees that these very remarks have no particular significance, and might indeed be made by any of the crowd, so that it might be without damage left to the final redactor or to the stage manager himself to put them into the mouth of somebody. Want of knowledge of the plot and the rest of the play is certainly not indicated in this way.

indeed be ascribed to him without difficulty. (Also it is a curious coincidence that 2 *Hen. VI*, in which Drayton's hand has been identified in my opinion by Else von Schaubert beyond a doubt, contains the Jack Cade scenes which are so very similar to the insurrection-scenes in our play.) Still one hesitates to consider Drayton as the author of our scene. A. W. Pollard's opinion, that "if these pages were not Shakespeare's work, the dramatist to whom on the ground of style and temper I would most readily assign them would be *Thomas Heywood*" seems to be nearer the mark. Heywood, as everybody who has read his plays knows, reminds one again and again of Shakespeare.* At the same time *he has* that sentimental vein, so unmistakable in the Moore speech. An admonition, *e.g.*, to a multitude to shed tears (cf. above, p. 48) would come natural from a man who, in *The Four Prentices of London* (*Works*, ii, 230), wrote about the Holy Land :

I wish that I could march upon my knees
In true submission, and right holy zeale.
Oh, since our warres are God's, abandon feares,
But in contrition weepe repentant teares.

This passage, besides slightly reminding of the More lines, "your unreverent knees—Make them your feet to kneele to be forgiven !" has something of the *sermon-like tone* too, which pervades large parts of More's speech. Also the unfortunate "babyes at their backes and their poor lugage" would be quite in Heywood's somewhat lachrymose style. Nor is that all. There are quite a number of curious parallels to the diction of the More scene in Heywood's works. Chambers finds (p. 177) the remark of Doll particularly Shakespearian : "Let's hear him : a keeps a plentiful shrevaltry, and a made my brother Arthur Watchins Sergeant Safe's yeoman : let's hear Shrieve More." Perhaps he is right, but it deserves mention that some passages in Heywood contain similar ideas. Says Reignald, the parasitical serving-man in *The English Traveller*,

* To quote one example for many, how similar is a passage like the following to Percy Hotspur's famous lines on "Honour" !—

So little do I reckon of the name
Of ugly Death, as, were he visible
I'de wrestle with him for the victory,
And tug the slave and teare him with my teeth
But I would make him stoope to Falconbridge
And for this life, this paltry brittle life,
This blast of winde. . . .

(1 *Edw. IV*, *Works* i, p. 54.)

iv, i, to old Lionel: "here . . . in time you may keep your shrievalty, and I be one o' the serjeants." The idea of the sheriff proving himself a benefactor to the speaker by appointing certain people serjeants or serjeants' yeomen may, it is true, have been common property to the time; the opinion, however, that "in a good hospitality there can be nothing found that's ill, *he that's a good housekeeper* keeps a good table," etc., and deserves all confidence, which the clown pronounces in Heywood's *English Traveller* (I, i), makes certainly a more individual impression. It mirrors in a remarkable way Doll's words: "I, byth mas, will we, Moor: [*sc. hear you*] *th'art a good houskeeper*," etc. Also the remark of Lincoln: "Our countrie is a great eating country," we find in the *Engl. Tr.* (i, i), "Our [English] appetites are not content but with the large excess of a full table," etc. Furthermore, the extremely rare word "to top" = "to lopp off," which we meet in Sir Thomas More's "that could have *topt the peace*"—Spedding altered it into "kept"—is to be found in the *Rape of Lucrece*, II, iii, "But when, in *topping* one, three Tarquins more . . . grow." The expression "*wash your foul minds with tears*" has several distant parallels in Shakespeare, but a very close one in the "*Woman Killed with Kindness*," v, iii: "but when *my tears have washed my black soul white*;" so also: "help me with your tears, to wash my spotted sins." The idea that disobedience to kings is a sin against God is expressed in the lines: "Treason to kings doth stretch even to the gods, And those high gods that take great Rome in charge Shall punish your rebellion" (*Rape of Lucrece*, v, ii). The expression "*god on earth*" applied to kings does occur in Shakespeare, it is true, though not in particularly trustworthy passages, *i.e.* *Rich. II*, v, iii, 136, and *Pericles*, I, i, 103. Heywood uses it repeatedly. Compare *The Fair Maid of the West*, I, v, 2: "I'd swear great Mullisheg To be a *god on earth*!" *The Golden Age* (*Works*, iii, p. 67): "Thou art a *God on earth*." The *displaying of dry geographical knowledge* ("go you to France or Flanders, To any Jarman province, Spaine or Portigall") which is so very unShakespearean finds quite a number of parallels in Heywood, compare *e.g.* *Woman Killed with Kindness*, v, iii: "*I'll over first to France, And so to Germany and Italy*." Or 1 Edw. IV, 1: "he neither comes from Italy nor Spain." Considering the fact that most of Heywood's plays from the very years in which *Sir Thomas More* seems to have originated are lost, this list of similarities is not quite inconsiderable,

though it of course by no means suffices to prove that the insurrection-scene be written by Heywood. Who knows how full of repetitions the old dramatists are will laugh at such idea.

On the other hand, I do not think that a simple statement that the handwriting is not Heywood's, should cause us to abandon the idea of his possible authorship.* To begin with, it must be proved incontestably that the "147 lines" are the author's original draft. I must confess, however, that this seems to me to be not quite beyond doubt. There are some points in the script which, to say the least, allow as well of the explanation of its being a copy,† none that *force* us to take it for the original.

If, then, we draw the conclusion from what has been put forward, the final judgment must needs be that Shakespeare's authorship of the "147 lines" is more than doubtful.

* Whether *Drayton's* handwriting is out of the question or not (see his hastily written lines in Oliver Elton's *Michael Drayton*, London, 1905, p. 86), I feel incompetent to judge.

† That a word like "help" is crossed out (71) and "advantage" is put in instead might happen to every one who copies a text and occasionally keeps only the sense of a word in his mind, "*watrie* parsnip," which he crossed out for "*sorry* parsnip," is even decidedly the more expressive word, which one wonders the author should not prefer. The words "*alas, alas*" which the writer D. interlined and C. deleted are so curiously out of place, that they might be the rest of some passage which had been crossed out in the original draft. The copyist found them left standing, felt uncertain, and reintroduced them in the end. It was not the only case in which he appended an omitted item. The most remarkable fact, however, is—a friend drew my attention to it—that a very high percentage of the mistakes in the text are due to a sort of anticipation during the writing. What is crossed out follows after a few words. The deleted "*sh*," line 28, seems to be "*Shro*" in the next line (for small *s* see line 38); "*ar*," 35, see 36: "*what ar*"; "*But*," 37, see second part of the sentence: "*but not men*"; 95, "*in*" see: "*you wer in armes*"; 102, "*le*," see: "*only lent*"; 107, "*ar*," see: "*as you are*"; 129, "*why you*," see 130: "*why you must*."

Does this point to the writer's composing while he wrote? A line e.g. like "*and twere in no error yf I told you all, you wer in armes gainst god*," in the first part of which the word "*in*" had to be deleted, might have originated, it seems to me, by the copyist having his finger or his eye erroneously already on the second "*wer in*." Also, in the "*But*" case of v. 37, the copyist made some such blunder. The mistake "*theise*," line 67, for "*the*," on the other hand, is too isolated to allow of important conclusions, because the word "*state*" follows: as "*theise*" = "*these*" (see line 144), the word may be due to *mis-hearing*, the "*s*" from "*state*" being drawn to the "*the*." But this quite clearly may be mere chance.

June, 1924.

A NOTE UPON CHAPTERS XX. AND XXI. OF THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE

By HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER

DR. CHAMBERS' work (and if ever a book deserved the dignified term, this does) forms a magnificent museum of facts about the Elizabethan stage. Thousands of specimens are ranged through the chapters, each in its place, each, it would seem, correctly and adequately labelled. An achievement indeed, and a benefit to be conferred upon generations of scholars, who will need no other authority. But, accepting the facts, one may yet question here and there Dr. Chambers' application of them. With the magnanimity of true learning, he gives one every chance to. For he scorns special pleading, comes charily to conclusions, opens every path by which the reader may reach his own.

I have but to deal with the two chapters upon the staging of plays in the theatres, though a glance will be needed besides at the preceding one upon staging at Court. To those students, however, for whom the plays and their artistry are the heart of the whole matter—and it is at least arguable that they are—these chapters must be the most important in the book. The greater the pity that they cannot be acclaimed the best. But the trouble is that no art lends itself wholly to scientific methods of criticism and research, and the art of the theatre least of any. For its ways are irrational, and the livelier parts of it are not to be ticketed and put in a museum. These lines upon lines of print that call themselves plays are but inadequate records of the full effect that author and actor conspired to produce. Dr. Chambers, as aforesaid, assembles his specimens, tests them, dissects them, compares them, does all that a right-minded man can be expected to do with them. It is nothing short of scandalous that they should not yield their every secret to the treatment. But they will not. And to make matters worse, we have here the art of the theatre at its wilfullest—as it survived and

CH. XX. & XXI. OF THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE 61

flourished in despite of civic regulation and æsthetic rule, under conditions which would be our despair to-day (unless we too should happily develop a high artistic resistance to respond to them), its achievement leaping in a half-century from *Gorboduc* to *King Lear*. Such a creature is unlikely to have behaved itself with any consistent regard for the interests and habits of the historian.

This is not to say that the work Dr. Chambers has done so supremely is unnecessary. It is, of course, the only sure foundation upon which we may build a knowledge of what the Elizabethan theatre in being really was. But, the foundation laid, we must, I suggest, for the next stage in the business, cut loose from the scientific method and attune ourselves imaginatively to those most unscientific persons—the Elizabethan playwright and actor. At least, it is by leaving both their vagaries and their virtues out of account as it seems to me, that in these two chapters Dr. Chambers is led, and leads us, somewhat astray.

We find, for instance, on the first page of chapter xx. :

But there is not much profit in attempting to investigate the methods of staging in the inns, of which we know nothing more than that quasi-permanent structures of carpenter's work came in time to supplement the doors, windows, and galleries which surrounded the yards; and so far as the published plays go, it is fairly apparent that up to the date of the suppression of Paul's, the Court, or at any rate the private interest, was the dominating one.

Surely this is a false start. Material may be lacking for a study of the staging in the inns. Nevertheless, here it was that the vitality which carried Elizabethan drama to its heights was generated, not at Court, in the Universities or at Paul's. What was done in the inns, then, must be far more significant, will have had a far stronger influence, than any tradition which may have been carried across from the semi-scholastic, semi-clerical, more ceremonial stage. Dr. Chambers says nothing which need discountenance this. But it is evident, I think, that for a view—so to speak—of the Theatre, the Globe and the Swan he takes his own stand, almost instinctively, with Lyly in the Chapel. He tries to explain in the light of experience there things which, for all apparent likeness, had undergone by, say, 1600 an almost essential change. What was this change? To try to cover it—inadequately therefore—in a phrase: on the inn stages emotional acting began to come by its own. This, I suggest, was the making of the drama's popularity; it was upon

this that the dramatists now built up their art. Other and rarer virtues some of them acquired. But the general advance was from plays that asked for little more than recitation to plays that were opportunities for acting, for the vivid realising of character in action.

Inevitably we think of the drama of the past in terms of the play and the playwright; of the greater plays and playwrights moreover, for these have survival value. To speak of *Othello* as an opportunity for Burbage seems absurd. But we must not forget this contemporary view of it. Nor were all playwrights Shakespeares—though this is made clear enough even with the best of them by one glance at their pages, by one excursion with them upon the stage. And we can imagine the literary quality of what has not survived. But then as ever the immediate virtue in a play written for a popular theatre was that it should be effectively actable. Consider further the conditions of the inn performances; the makeshift stage, the work-a-day surroundings, the changes of the weather, the unruly audience. Something was needed with a stronger grip than had sufficed to hold the attention of a decorous assembly shut in the quiet of a hall. The Clown, in his way, provided it. There was nothing new, though, about the Clown. But emotional acting must have been a revelation. It was crude enough at first, no doubt, based at its best upon rhetoric, at its worst on ranting, taking example both from the preacher and the demagogue. But the great discovery had been made that an actor, deeply moved himself, could move and entrance the motliest audience by mere make-believe. What was Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba? But he had changed colour, had tears in his eyes—and so had his hearers. Then drama ceased to be a show and became an emotional experience (and under that condition and that condition only can it be expected to flourish). It took time to develop all the possibilities of the business; and up to a point—not reached, however, till the inns had been superseded—the enlargement is truly amazing. Nor, of course, did the popular theatre scorn help from anywhere. It would take plots from Plutarch or the police news, borrow traditions, costumes, properties, boy-actors, no doubt, if it could, from Paul's—whatever came handy. In time æsthetic principles were thrust on it. And at last it found itself roofed in and respectable, playing by candlelight to the sort of audience that would sit listening to good music between the acts. And after this happens the plays—do they not?—tend to “go soft.”

This much, at least, is plain. From the outburst of activity in the inns to the height of the Globe's and the Fortune's fame, dramatic development produced the sort of play which concentrated attention upon the actor and his emotions. Bit by bit auxiliary aids came in; grand costumes and processions to display them, fine properties, and occasions must be made to use them. Then the actor himself was no longer asked to make quite such heroic efforts. He still had, though, to step out on the bare boards, in shine or cloud, wind or calm, and, with little but the poetry in his mouth for a weapon, to quell his audience and keep it his own. Truly when the effort was not genuinely heroic it must often have been absurd. Sophistication—sometimes called good taste—discovered this. But it was the power of moving audiences by such means which made the Elizabethan drama both at its best and its worst the thing it was. Therefore the conditions of its writing and staging during the time of its growth were, we may pretty safely suppose, closely related to this. Documents are lacking; but had Dr. Chambers hired an inn-yard and a mob (of medical students, shall we say, on holiday?), some boards and trestles and tapestry, and faced his problem there, though he might have despaired of its solution, he would have sized it up correctly.

But when he speaks of "the various types of scene which the sixteenth-century managers were called upon to produce," of "the degree of use which they make of a structural background," of "a certain number of scenes which make no use of a background at all, and may in a sense be called unlocated scenes . . ." and tells us that "it must be borne in mind that they were located to the audience, who saw them against a background, although, if they were kept well to the front or side of the stage, their relation to that background would be minimised"—well, I protest that the sixteenth-century manager, at any rate, would not have known what he meant by such talk. The play was acted upon a stage. The actors came on the stage and went off it. That was the basis of the business. For the action certain "practicabilities" would be needed. If it were a bed, a chair, or a table, the things themselves could be supplied. A tent, a door, a balcony, a battlement—whatever was available and would answer the purpose of the action sufficed, for it had to suffice. But—this is the point—these things existed *ad hoc* only, and for the actors' convenience. They had, so to speak, no life and no rights of their own. Juliet's room with

its balcony was on the upper stage because Romeo must be down below and out of reach. It did not trouble the audience to find the same room a little later on the lower stage. The room sprang up, in effect, wherever and whenever the action required it. Nor would it trouble them that Romeo and she should be taking their farewells above, that the nurse should say, "Your lady mother's coming to your chamber," that Romeo should descend by his tackle stair, stay for a little on the main stage, leave it; then, after Juliet's five lines alone, that she should at her mother's call descend to that same main stage to finish the scene there—for she undoubtedly did. It is, perhaps, even misleading to say that she carried the scene with her. For there was no scene, nor any sense of locality implied, apart from the immediate effect required by the action. This might indeed be an important one to make and even to sustain, as in the balcony scene, as in the tomb scene; then it would be made and sustained for as long as need be and as was most practically convenient. But having had his use of it, the dramatist would neglect and obliterate a locality without further consideration. The consciousness of it in the audience's imagination might be compared to a mirage, suddenly appearing, imperceptibly fading. The true landscape lay in the characters and the tale of themselves that they told. Or again, tell a stage staff to-day that the Elizabethan theatre used not scenes but properties, and the whole matter would seem plain to them. They would at once begin a most interesting discussion as to where the line between the two could be drawn. Every stage-manager has had to arbitrate in this perennial dispute. It is not a mere trades union matter; it affects the dignity of a craft. No one, as a matter of fact, has ever been able to draw a line; but every one will tell you that he knows the difference. Scenery is something to look at; a property is a thing to use. But—! A property is movable; scenery stands. But—! Had Dr. Chambers assisted on a few such occasions, he would have needed no better introduction to the traditional mind of the theatre and its working. It deals in effects, quite shamelessly. And it is not a logical mind, it has no need to be.

Instead, he goes to great trouble to enumerate the many sorts of places besides the ever-recurring no-particular-place-at-all which had, he contends, to be suggested to an Elizabethan audience. "This, then," he tells us, "is the practical problem which the

manager of an Elizabethan theatre had to solve—the provision of settings, not necessarily so elaborate or decorative as those of the Court, but at least intelligible, for open-country scenes, battle and siege scenes, garden scenes, street and threshold scenes, hall scenes, chamber scenes.” Once more, I don’t believe the Elizabethan manager would have admitted that a problem existed. Every now and then a playwright’s imagination might get the better of his tactical discretion ; for certainly tactics are involved. It is all a question of what actors with their make-believe can convince you of, or make you forget ; and they must never be let seem to be trying to convince you. Ask them to do nothing awkward, that’s all.

Is it rash to assert that while the Elizabethan drama was most itself there was no problem of locality ? It had existed maybe, and it was to arise again. A self-conscious dramatist like Jonson might feel interested in raising it. Dr. Chambers’ citation of *Every Man out of His Humour* is suggestive. But he remarks that “the experiment was not repeated.” No, at that time it would not be. Why deliberately abandon a state of innocence and freedom ? How many instances of “localisation by dialogue” in the common run of plays show any consistent consideration for the ability of the stage-manager to reinforce them ? Are they not themselves, rather, mere reinforcements for the actor in his task of capturing and enlarging the audience’s imagination, and only provided if and as they will be ? Marlowe takes care to emphasise the shifting of the action in Dr. Faustus from Wittenberg to Rome, to the Emperor’s Court and back to Wittenberg. Why ? Because this ranging of the world is an essential part of the dramatic effect of the play. But turn to Shakespeare’s *Richard II*. The audience would know already about as much as it was dramatically profitable for them to know of the story’s general environment. And we find that out of nineteen scenes only nine are localised, and all but about three of these quite casually. In one case the transference from Barkloughly castle to Flint castle depends on a half line spoken by Richard which an audience might easily not hear. And if they did miss it, and thought Richard was still at Barkloughly while Shakespeare thought he was at Flint, this would make not one pennyworth of difference to the dramatic effect of the play. Nor need it dramatically follow, for that matter, because Richard said “Go to Flint Castle,” that he, or anybody listening to him, went there. Rather the contrary. But here the unfettered

mind of the dramatist can be seen. Shakespeare read that Richard did go to Flint; and "go to Flint Castle," coming where it does, gives just that effect of the wretched king being driven from pillar to post which he wants to give. But he bothered no more about it, for the next effect he wanted lay in Bolingbroke's

Go to the rude ribs of that ancient castle,

and it no longer mattered to him whether it was Flint or another.

He paints a little verbal scenery when he needs it. But, again, it is more for effect than exactitude:

I am a stranger here in Gloucestershire,
These high wild hills and rough uneven ways. . . .

The whole speech is upon travelling and its tediousness, the scattering and gathering of men. And it is the sense of this the actors have to convey; the fact that they are in Gloucestershire is the least important thing about it.* Nor would anything an Elizabethan stage-manager could do help us to realise either the locality or the high hills. We may presume an inner stage (though *Richard II.* can be played without one), and that, for this scene, its curtains would be better closed than open. Let so much be conceded. An inner stage did by use and wont suggest an interior of some sort, for it was the convenient place to set furniture in, or from which to bring it forth; and why distract the audience's attention to the empty place uselessly? But there would always be the upper stage, plain to be seen, or equally to be ignored.

Nor is this cavalier treatment of background to be attributed to undeveloped stagecraft. In *Antony and Cleopatra* Shakespeare is at the height of his powers, his technical ability is at full stretch, he is opulent in his use of it. And now, in one respect, locality is of great importance to his scheme. The whole import of the play's action lies in the contrast and clash of Egypt and Rome. To emphasise even the more that there are world affairs in hand, a scene in Parthia is added. Marlowe's crude methods of marking

* For a masterly piece of such painting see *Macbeth* III. iii.:

The west yet glimmers with some streaks of day;
Now spurs the 'lated traveller apace
To gain the timely inn. . . .

But where is the care for locality here? As well look for it in a piece of music. And a hundred such instances could be quoted.

a whereabouts have been far surpassed.* The characters themselves, their costumes, the matter of the scenes, tell us all we need to know of their whereabouts. But how little we do need to know! We are (like the soldiers in the Great War) "somewhere in Egypt," or in Italy, or Rome. Not till we have left Alexandria is Alexandria named; not for seventy-five lines of this first scene of Cæsar's, and then only by the indirect

Let his shames quickly
Drive him to Rome;

are we told whither we have moved. This, however, both seems natural and is dramatically sufficient. People do not name Alexandria, being in it, and for the play's purpose where Cæsar is is Rome. Modern editors kindly tell us that Act II. Sc. i. passes in Pompey's house in Messina. Shakespeare neither points nor hints at either house or place. Act III. Sc. iv., by the same authority, is at Athens in a room in Antony's house. Not till two scenes later does the play itself give any colour for even half the statement. Now no dramatist leaves matters of any current importance to *ex post facto* disclosure. Nor—though the editors never fail us with their rooms in houses and "another room in the same"—are there through the first two acts any suggestions for interior or exterior backgrounds, nor is any problem presented of their provision, unless, as for the scene on Pompey's galley, the action of the play absolutely requires it. Cleopatra might receive the messenger indoors or out; there must be seats for Antony and Cæsar, but they might sit outdoors or in. And when we reach the third and fourth acts the dramatic advantage in this apparent vagueness (and it might be contended that Shakespeare is a little—but only a little—more vague than usual) is to be seen. Look at Act III. Scenes viii. and ix. *Enter Cæsar and Taurus with his army, marching*. Six lines are spoken and the scene ends. *Enter Antony and Enobarbus*. Four lines are spoken and the scene ends.

Surely here all considerations of the validity of backgrounds are knocked endways. Not only can no stage-manager—Elizabethan or other—face such a material problem, but it is absurd to suppose that Shakespeare ever meant so to dissipate his play's strength

* It does not follow that Shakespeare thought them crude merely because they were simple. But in *Antony and Cleopatra* he happened to have a theme in which characters and localities fell naturally (with one exception) into "a concatenation accordingly." The whereabouts did not need explicit elucidation.

and to distract his audience by asking them positively to imagine Cæsar and Taurus and an army in a definite locality for two minutes, and then—hey presto—Antony and Enobarbus in the same locality, or any other, for the space of one. He was not that sort of a playwright. Dr. Chambers sees the difficulty. But he says that the play might almost be regarded as “a challenge to classicists,” and that “Shakespeare must surely have been in some danger, in this case, of outrunning the apprehension of his auditory. . . .”*

With all respect I suggest that precisely here Dr. Chambers' own misapprehension of the artistry of the Elizabethan stage, in its normal aspect and greatest aspect, is summed up and brought to a head. He speaks quite rightly of Shakespeare's “auditory.” That is just what they were, and all but nothing besides. The *vision* of the audience comprised the speakers and actors of the play, and such material things, as by their use of them, they brought to a momentary life, an apparent reality. Further than this it did not stray. Apart from the use that inner, outer, and upper stage were momentarily put to they were nothing, they were artistically non-existent. And scene after scene might pass with the actors moving to all intents merely in the ambit of the play's story and of their own emotions; unless, the spell broken, they were suddenly and incongruously seen to be upon a stage.

Antony and Cleopatra may push this stagecraft to its limit; I believe it does. But that here was the essence of the stagecraft bred upon the inn stages is, I think, demonstrable. There were, of course, other influences at work; those traditions of the Court stage and of Paul's, upon which Dr. Chambers insists. But I suggest that during the great days of the outdoor theatres these lay quiescent. They probably began to revive when the conditions which suited them were revived by the King's company's entry into the Blackfriars. The revival would take effect but slowly, for the accumulated weight of the other movement had to spend itself. And a further, quite important factor in the matter is that back-grounds can be made effective indoors and by a constant artificial

* These scenes are technically akin to such a scene as *Julius Cæsar* v. i., in which the armies confront one another. And Dr. Chambers himself quotes others, ranging over his whole period, which can be rounded into this convention. But had the audience been asked, any one of them, as to *where* precisely these generals and their armies were, it would have been thought an idle question and very disturbing to the actual illusion which was created.

light ; outdoors they are more trouble than they are worth. But all the conditions of indoor playing made for a less robust sort of drama. Such surroundings are favourable to prettiness of every sort. So then the movement took shape which resulted in the scenic theatre as we now know it. The conventions of locality hardened more and more, and the actor became, so to speak, a collaborator with the scenery—and not always the more prominent partner. Sheer illusion did not come into question for a very long time. But the decorative tradition of the Court Mask would have been picked up where Lyly and his school had left it, and adapted to the plays then being written until plays came to be written which were themselves adapted to decoration.* One may surmise, though, that this movement gathered strength rather after 1616—at which date Dr. Chambers' investigations most unluckily stop—than before. One can but wish he would continue them, and show us how scenery, as we now understand it—as he, by my contention, a little prematurely understands it—did come by its own, and what were the dramatic losses and gains in this passage from the freedom of the platform stage to our present confines of visual illusion.

And I could wish besides that for aid to such scientific research—Dr. Chambers' and much excellent work akin to it—there existed something like a laboratory in which theories and deductions could be put to practical test. The notion is not quite a fantastic one. With its far more imperative demands well satisfied, our English theatre could easily make provision for a thing of the sort ; though it is no part of my present task even to adumbrate its workings. But they would certainly spare the researchers much speculation and their critics much argument. For the playwrights of three hundred years ago were practical men—they had to be. The chief component of the medium they worked in, the human actor, is still extant, and little changed by lapse of time. And by the process of trial and error the rest of the material, puzzling as it may seem in the careless record left of it, would often fit into place with surprising ease. Even the most expert of stage-managers, even the playwright himself, will find that his own play, coming into action, surprises him by its behaviour, sometimes pleasantly, sometimes

* Though, of course, such plays—plays intended primarily for indoor performance—had been written occasionally all through the intervening period. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is probably one of them.

the reverse. How then should the student, working *in vacuo*, expect to make certain of these things? I rhetorically suggested that Dr. Chambers might have done well by hiring an inn-yard and personally exploring its theatrical possibilities. Quite seriously, if some of the theorists, whose aimless suggestions his fine, stern habit of investigation must put to shame, could be set to acting a play or so upon a stage of their devising, if they could agree upon one (and I should dearly like to have the casting of the play) they would learn more in a week than they will persuade each other of in a generation. Dr. Chambers himself, I think, would forswear his misguided allegiance to the Swan drawing if he were set to work for a little in a theatre built on its lines. It is all but inconceivable that any manager or dramatist, with a variety of plays to produce, and the conveniences of the inn-yards and the theatre for model, should deliberately handicap themselves by setting up those two foolish doors.* Nor, after a little experience, would he try, as he now tries, to pin his dramatists to any consistency over their "withins" and "withouts," "aboves" and "belows." Sometimes, it is true, they might be writing in terms of the actual stage.

Farewell, farewell ! one kiss and I'll descend,

says Romeo. And descend he does, from the upper to the lower stage. But when, twenty lines or so later, Juliet questions about her mother—

Is she not down so late, or up so early ?

she is speaking in terms of the play alone, and of Capulet's imaginary house.

He ran this way, and leap'd this orchard wall,

says Benvolio. There may have been a wall. It is as likely there was none. It could have stood nowhere but across the opening of the inner stage. If Romeo leaped it in the right direction for his playing of the following scene, Mercutio and Benvolio must have played their scene behind it. That is possible. But nothing

* My own guess—it is, of course, no more—about the Swan drawing is that de Witt drew it from memory ; and that he had also been seeing some play performed in a great hall, that of the Middle Temple or another. There is the screen, and roughly as he has drawn them those two doors would have stood. The Elizabethan stage-manager could of course fit his play to such accommodation easily enough (Mr. William Poel's performances in all sorts of odd places are evidence enough of this). But it does not follow that he would want to perpetuate it.

would worry an Elizabethan audience less than to see Romeo vanish through a door or behind a curtain, be told two lines later that he had leaped a wall, and see him another forty lines later dodge on the stage again through door or curtain. The stage was being turned from some lane or other into the orchard beneath Juliet's window : but this information only definitely reached them when Juliet appeared, and herself absorbed their attention.

Dr. Chambers speaks of Imogen's chamber, with Iachimo's trunk and the elaborate fireplaces in it. The trunk, yes ; for Iachimo has to emerge from one. But has he not noticed that the detailed description of the tapestries and the chimneypiece comes two long scenes later ? Iachimo, in the room itself, merely refers to :

Such and such pictures ; there the windows ; such
The adornment of her bed ; the arras, figures,
Why, such and such. . . .

Shakespeare carefully avoids, that is to say, calling particular attention to what is not there. When Shallow bids Falstaff "in with him" to dinner, the action will suit with the word well enough for there to be no question between the door on the stage and the door of that excellent gentleman's house. But when we are in the tavern—as the applejohns and the dress of the Drawers and a reference to "the room where they supped" will tell us—and we hear that Ancient Pistol is "below," Shakespeare is quite obviously writing in terms of the play's fiction only ; as anybody will quickly discover if he tries to act the scene upon an upper stage. Tiresome, inconsistent fellows, these Elizabethan playwrights !

THE REVELS BOOKS: THE WRITER OF THE "MALONE SCRAP"

BY D. T. B. WOOD

THE genuineness of the suspected Revels Books was supposed by many to have been settled on internal evidence by Mr. Ernest Law's pamphlet *Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries* in 1911. The controversy was recently revived by the indefatigable protagonist of the doubters, Mrs. Stopes, opposed by Mr. W. J. Lawrence. The most detailed and balanced account of the whole matter may perhaps be found in Dr. E. K. Chambers' *Elizabethan Stage*. He is careful to point out the importance of the *Scrap*.

I must apologise for intruding in the field of Shakespearian scholarship with so little equipment. I do not propose to follow Mr. Ernest Law or Mrs. Stopes through the labyrinth of dramatic representations. The clue I hope to provide may make it unnecessary.

Some months ago I was shown the Books for the first time by two partisans of opposite factions. One in one ear and one in the other told the whole tale. I was drawn irresistibly to a fresh examination for myself. I found no detailed description of the outward and visible points of the documents, and proceeded to make one.

The papers were of the period, and the water-marks easily identified. The paper in each gathering was the same throughout, and the make-up of the packets precluded forgery except on a page originally left blank. I was left, however, with a vague impression against their genuineness on the ground of discrepancies in the forms of letters, on peculiarities in the arrangement of the matter, and the general "woolly" appearance of the 1604-5 play-list.

I saw that the matter was pivoted on the identification of the writer of the *Malone Scrap*. I tried Malone, the younger James Boswell, and others whom I thought likely, but by some freak of fortune omitted the name of the undoubted writer.

1604 & 1605 Ed^d. Tylney
 Sunday after Hallowmas - Merry wifes of
 Windsor - perf.^d by the K's players
 Hallamas - in the Banqueting ho. at Whitehall
 the Moore of Venns - perf.^d by the K's players
 On S^t. Stephens Night - Measure for Measure
 by Shaeberd - perf.^d by the K's players
 On Innocents Night - Evon by Shaeberd
 perf.^d by the K's players
 On Sunday following "How to fearre if a
 woman be wooed" by Hewood
 perf.^d by the Q's players
 On New Year Night - All foole by J. Chapman
 perf.^d by the Boyes of the Chapel
 On New y^r. day & hallowe day -
 Loves Labour lost perf.^d by the K's p.^r
 on the 7th Jan. The Hen. the fifth perf.^d by the K's p.^r
 on 8th Jan - Every one out of his humour
 on Candlemas night Every one in his humour
 on Shrove Sunday "The Merchant of Venns"
 by Shaeberd - perf.^d by the K's p.^r
 The Repertory on Shrove Sunday by the K's Com^d

Park place S. James
 Tues 7 June 85

Dear Sir

The laws of the Customs are so multifarious & the exposition of them so often depends upon practice or an alto. Genl^l opinion - that it is impossible to answer every ²⁴ ~~Letter~~ upon short notice without having recourse to the Books of the office - which I sh^d have been glad to have done with regard to the subject of y^r Letter but as you require an answer before I go out I can only say from memory that I think I recollect actual instances where new sails & Cordage have been made to pay the duty - nor do I think that the quantity that escapes of such a magnitude as to require a peremptory remedy shall events the method that is taken to compel such payment will cost the Revenue more than it will gain. Super Tideswaiters must be kept on board till the ship is cleared & their pay will probably exceed the Duties besides the prejudice to the owners in taking in an outward bound cargo which cannot be done till the ship is cleared inwards - and it will be almost impossible for the Captⁿ to recollect every bit of Cordage that he may have bought but some fine weather may not have used on the voyage it can only be done by overhauling the ship's stores on her arrival which will unavoidably divert his attention from an object of much more importance to the Revenue which is the making a

full & true report of the Loading of Merchantable Goods which with all their care is now sufficiently difficult but will be much more so when the ships stores are to be involved in

upon the whole the clause seems oppressive on the owners & mariners of shipping without any real advantage to the Revenue & seems contrived only by the monopolizing narrow spirit of manufacturers - and after all if the fact be true as stated by them that new ships stores remaining on board do not in practice now pay duty (which I doubt) then this clause certainly imposes a new duty ^{on goods that paid no duty before} and is against the rules of the House but if the Duties are demanded on all just occasions then the clause is unnecessary at all even if I think it sho^d not be admitted into a Bill proposing a very different object where the Revenue officers ~~will~~ ^{are} probably not expecting it will never see it - It sho^d I think be omitted now & the Manufacturers sho^d state their case to the Treasury who will of course refer it to the Board of Customs where it may be investigated & the clause if necessary inserted in the Hodge-podge Bill -

In answer to your 2^d Question It seems very clear to me that "all his Majesty's subjects" includes Ireland



I am sincerely Yrs &c.

The hope manufacture is in a most flourishing state - the prices are ^{high} ~~low~~ ^{with the hands of men} ~~low~~ and I believe it does not need any aid to enable this business to



Assuming for the moment forgery, the likeliest criminal seemed to be Payne Collier. He made in his *Defence* in 1860 continual appeals to the fact that Malone had seen and copied entries said to have been forged. One of these copies—the list of players (including Shakespeare) at Dulwich—was said by him to be in a printed book (Malone's *Inquiry*), then in the hands of Payne Collier and now in the British Museum. It was not in Malone's hand.

At the same time, in a critique by Payne Collier on Thomas Churchyard, annotated and corrected by himself, I found a sonnet on Sydney, which he said was inserted on a blank leaf in Thomas Churchyard's *A true Diurnal Historicall*. . . . The curious thing was that the alterations in the sonnet were little less than a complete re-writing, impossible to any one but the author.

Were these two insertions "plants"?

Was the *Malone Scrap* another "plant"?

I examined Sir Frederick Madden's correspondence at the British Museum, which contains a number of letters of Payne Collier in a hand not very dissimilar to that of the *Malone Scrap*. I was confronted almost immediately in 1839 by paper similar to that of the *Scrap*. The Malone MS. 29 in which it was found came to the Bodleian in 1838. I was courteously permitted to look at the Bodleian registers, and found that Payne Collier was there in 1842, the year in which Cunningham published the Revels Books. The prop seemed a little weakened. It was necessary to destroy or to strengthen it. Hence my letter to the *Times* on July 2, 1924. I hoped controversy would settle the matter. It has; but not as I imagined. I continued my investigations, expecting, I will own, to pin another forgery upon Payne Collier.

I had by this time all the *nuances* of the hand of the *Malone Scrap* at my fingers' ends. I was looking at the letters of Sir William Musgrave, of the Audit Office, to which the Books belonged, when my attention was drawn to the marked similarity of two characteristics, the small *n*'s (*n*) with a straight tail and the small *d*'s (*ð*) curved with a curl at the top (see facsimiles). Was this the hand? A close comparison of every letter with the hand in that immense accumulation made by Musgrave, the *Musgrave Obituary*, showed a fairly good agreement. Letters which differed at first sight were found to be written both ways; and two or three other marked characteristics appeared in both hands—the way in which the

writer draws up final a, e and r. I was finally convinced by finding the rather curious V which occurs twice in Venice in the *Scrap*. The unbeliever suddenly became a convert, and began to orient himself to the points of the new situation. The difficulty of the paper solved itself when the identical water-mark appeared on paper adjacent to one of Musgrave's letters. The accompanying facsimiles show the general appearance of the two hands to be similar, and any one who makes a more critical examination will probably have little doubt that the hands are the same. It is hardly necessary for me to emphasise particular points, for practically every letter found in the *Scrap* can be paralleled in the facsimiles ii and iii, here given of Musgrave's writing: but special attention may be drawn to B, E, G, H, K, L, Q, and to the frequent use of dashes in place of stops.

The position, therefore, now is that Malone received the *Scrap* from Sir William Musgrave (who died in 1800) somewhere about the year 1791, when Malone inspected the records of the Master of the Revels. It remains for myself or another to unearth a letter of Malone or Musgrave alluding to the matter.

How the identification of Musgrave as the writer of the *Scrap* affects the question of the genuineness of the Revels Books I should like to be allowed to discuss later. It may be pointed out that Halliwell Phillipps, who first brought the *Scrap* to notice, still regarded the Revels Books as forged.

ELIZABETHAN STAGE GLEANINGS

By E. K. CHAMBERS

THE following notes which I have collected since the publication of *The Elizabethan Stage* are perhaps worth putting upon record. For leave to print the transcripts from the *Hatfield MSS.* in Nos. ii. and iii. I am indebted to the courtesy of the Marquess of Salisbury and his librarian, Mr. W. Stanhope-Lovell.

i. *A Play of Massinissa and Sophonisba.*

Writing from France, when he was English ambassador, to Sir William Cecil on April 10, 1565, Sir Thomas Smith says (*R.O. Foreign Papers*, lxxvii. f. 144; cf. *Calendar*, vii. 330):

I am right glad that my L. Keaper is so well restored to her *Maiesties* favour, and wish my self to have been at the Tragedie of Massinissa and Sophonisba. Yt was in latyn I suppose or the French Ambassadour was not much the wiser for it.

In the absence of Cecil's letter, I cannot locate this early play on a theme afterwards used by Marston. Conceivably it may have been the Gray's Inn play at court on March 5 or 6, 1565 (*Elizabethan Stage*, i. 161; iv. 82, 143). It was in English and had a dialogue of goddesses on marriage, but this may have been an epilogue. The Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, had been in temporary disfavour, on a suspicion of encouraging a tract in favour of a Protestant settlement of the succession. No royal visit to Gorhambury in connexion with his reconciliation is upon record. The French ambassador was Paul de Foix.

ii. *The Date of Richard II.*

I called attention to the following letter (*Cecil MS.* 36, 60; cf. *Calendar of Hatfield MSS.* v. 487) in *Elizabethan Stage*, ii. 194:

Sir, findinge that you wer not convenientlie to be at London to morrow night I am bold to send to knowe whether Teusdaie [9 Dec.]

may be anie more in *your* grace to visit poore Channon rowe where as late as it shal please you a gate for *your* supper shal be open : & K. Richard present him self to *your* vewe. Pardon my boldnes that ever love to be honored with *your* presence nether do I importune more then *your* occasions may willingly assent unto, in the meantime & ever restinge

At *your* command

EDW. HOBY.

[*Addressed*] To the Right Honorable Sir Rob. Cecil knight one of her *Maiesties* most honorable privie Councill.

[*Endorsed*] Sir Edw. Hobbie to my Master ; [*and*] 7 Dec. 1595 ; [*and in another hand*] readable.

This seems to suggest a performance of *Richard II.*, and, if so, confirms the date of 1595 for Shakespeare's play, to which the parallels in the second, but not the first, edition of Daniel's *Civil Wars* in that year have been thought to point. Some "conceit" of Richard II. from Cecil, which amused the Earl of Essex, is referred to in a letter from Sir Walter Raleigh of July 6, 1597 (Edwardes, ii. 169). This was some time before the talk of a political analogy between Richard II. and Elizabeth, which caused trouble in the later career of Essex.

iii. *The Lord Chamberlain at a Play.*

This letter is taken from *Cecil MS.* 108, 61 ; cf. *Calendar of Hatfield MSS.* xiv. 288.

Your L. hath done me some disgraces *which* greive me so much as I must complayne thereof to *your L.* And that *which* greiveth me most is the publicke disgrace *which your L.* gave me at the play on Sonday night not only before many of my frendes that thought *your L.* did me wronge but in the hearinge of my wife who beinge with childe did take it so ill as she wept and complayned in the place, for I cam to her but to aske her how she did & not to stay there, and *your L.* liftinge up *your* staffe at me, called me sirra and bide me gett me lower saucy fellowe besides other wordes of disgrace. All *which* though I bear patiently at *your L.* handes, yet because [it] seemes to proceede of some spightfull informacion of me *which* I am loth sholde harbor in *your L.* opinyon, I beseech *your L.* to give me leave to say that I knowe noe cause why *your L.* or any other sholde despise me. For my birth I am indeed one of the meanest of my kindred, but yet not base : but well descended as many honorable persons the L. Keper, the Erle of Essex, the Countesse of Warwicke and others of good quality in the courte to whom I am allyed doe knowe. My educacion hath been allwayes like a gentleman both here in Englande and biyonde the seas, and such as hath bene so made knowne to her *Maiestie* by divers of her counsell as her *Maiestie* was pleased to knowe me & thinke

me worthy to serve her, as Sir John Stanhope can witness, Sir Roberte Cecill also was present when her *Maiestie* of her selfe named me for secretary for the French tonge. Besides my life hath been honest and my behavior respective, and I thank God I am noe begger (though the worse by a 1000l by means of your L. crossinge of me). These thinges I speak not in vayne glory for alas they are but meane thinges and agreable to the poore countenance I carry, but to lett your L. knowe that I deserve not so much your displeasure or skorne. Therefore I beseech your L. cancell your ill opinyon of me and forbear to despise me or to disgrace me till your L. shall see me doe any thinge indiscretely or unworthy a gentleman. I could have procurredd many either of the counsell or the nobility to deal with your L. herein and to be mediators for your favor but it shall be needles if your L. will be pleased to take this in good parte at my handes which I protest is meant only to remove your L. ill opinyon from me and to prevent further disgrace, this beinge the gratest that ever I received in my life and most unworthily. And so I pray God to prosper your honor. Your L. in all humbleness.

EDW. JONES.

[Addressed] To the Right honorable the L. Cobham L. Chamberlyn of her *Maiesties* houshold give these.

The only winter play season during which William Lord Cobham was Lord Chamberlain is that of 1596-7, and in this two plays, both by Lord Hunsdon's men, were given on Sundays, being Dec. 27, 1596, and Feb. 6, 1597. To one of these the episode described must relate. The functions of the Lord Chamberlain and his staff at plays are noted in *E.S.* i. 39. Edward Jones, who had previously served Sir Thomas Heneage, the Vice-Chamberlain, and Sir John Puckering, the Lord Keeper, became a secretary to the Earl of Essex in August, 1596. His colleague, Edward Reynolds, who was aggrieved at the appointment, describes him as "a great translator of books" and "a special man of language" (*T. Birch, Memoirs of Elizabeth*, i. 87, 90, 91, 118; ii. 107, 243). Lord Cobham was father-in-law of Robert Cecil, and doubtless, like his son and successor, no friend to Essex and his followers.

iv. *The Roaring Girl*.

Mr. F. W. X. Fincham, in his interesting *Notes from the Ecclesiastical Court Records at Somerset House* (1921, 4 *R. Hist. Soc. Trans.* iv. 103), gives the following from the *Consistory of London Correction Book* (1605-6) under the date of 1605:—

Officium domini contra Marion Frith.

This day and place the said Mary appeared personally, and then and

there voluntarily confessed that she had long frequented all or most of the disorderly and licentious places in this cittie, as namely she hath usually in the habit of a man resorted to alehouses, taverns, tobacco shops, and also to play houses, there to see plaies and proses [? prizes], and namely, being at a play about three quarters of a yeare since at *the Fortune* in mans apparel and in her boots and *with* a sword at her syde, she told the company then present *that* she thought many of them were of opinion that she was a man, but if any of them would come to her lodging they should finde she is a woman; and some other immodest and lascivious speeches she also used at *that* time, and also sat upon the stage in the public viewe of all the people there present in mans apparel and played upon her lute and sange a song; and she further confessed *that* she hathe for this long time past usually blasphemed and dishonoured the name of God by swearing and cursing and by tearing God out of his Kingdome, yf it were possible, and hathe also usually associated herself *with* ruffianly, swaggering and lewd company, as namely with cutpurses, blasphemers, drunkards, and others of bad note and of most dissolute behaviour, *with* whome she hathe to the great shame of her sexe oftentimes, as she said, drunk hawe and distempered her heade with drinke: and further confesseth *that* she was punished for the misdemeanours aforementioned in Bridewell: she was since upon *Christmas* day and night taken in Paules Church *with* her peticoate tucked up about her in the fashion of a man *with* a mans cloake on her, to the great scandall of diverse persons who understood the same and to the disgrace of all womanhood: and she sayeth and protesteth *that* she is heartily sorry for her foresayd licentious and dissolute life, and giveth her earnest promise to carry and behave herself and ever from henceforth honestly and soberly and womanly, and resteth ready to undergo any censure or punishment for her misdemeanours aforesaid in such manner and forme as shall be assigned her by the Lord Bishop of London her ordinary: and then she being pressed to declare whether she had not been dishonest of her body, and hath not also drawne other women to lewdness by her perswasions and by carrying herself like a bawd, she absolutely denied *that* she was chargeable *with* either of these imputations; and hereupon his Lordship thought fit to remand her to Bridewell from whence she now came, untill he might further examine the truth of the misdemeanours inforced against her *without* laying as yet any further censure upon her.

This confirms the interpretation (*E.S.* iii. 297) of a passage in the epilogue to the Fortune play of *The Roaring Girl* as referring to a forthcoming appearance of Mary Frith on the stage. But its date cancels Bullen's argument that Mary had not arrived at notoriety early enough to make plausible Fleay's conjecture of 1604-5 as a date for *The Roaring Girl*.

(To be continued.)

SOME NOTES ON DRYDEN

BY G. THORN-DRURY

i. *Dryden and Daniel.*

IN his observations before *All for Love* Scott mentions, without comment, the fact that he had not read Daniel's *Cleopatra*: later editors seem to have followed his example, and therefore the use that Dryden made of his predecessors' work has not been noted. It is interesting to compare the following passages in the two plays:—

- (a) 'Tis sweet to die when we are forc'd
to liue.

*The Tragedie of Cleopatra. (The
Works of Samuel Daniel . . .
1601.) F.v.*

'Tis sweet to die when they would
force life on me.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

- (b) Glittering in all her pompous rich
array,
Great Cleopatra sate . . .

Even as she was when on thy cristall
streames,

Cleare Cydnos she did shew what
earth could shew.

When Asia all amaz'd in wonder
deemes

Venus from heaven was come on
earth below.

Even as she went at first to meete her
Loue,

So goes she now at last againe to
find him.

Cleopatra, K. ii. verso.

- (c) And you deare reliques of my Lord
and Love,

O let no impious hand dare to
remoue

You out from hence, but rest you
here for euer.

Let Egypt now give peace vnto you
dead,

That liuing gave you trouble and
turmoile.

Cleopatra, I. iii.

Why, 'tis to meet my love;
As when I saw him first, on Cydnus'
bank,
All sparkling, like a goddess: so
adorn'd,

I'll find him once again.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

Hail, you dear relics
Of my immortal love!
O let no impious hand remove you
hence;

But rest for ever here! Let Egypt
give

His death that peace, which it
denied his life.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

- (d) Better then Death, Death's office
thou dischargest,
And with a pleasing sleepe our
soule inlargest,

That open canst with such an easie
key
The doore of life, come gentle
cunning thiefe,
That from our selues so steal'st our
selues away.

Cleopatra, K. iii.

- (e) False flesh (saith she) and what dost
thou conspire
With *Cæsar* too, as thou wert none
of ours.

Cleopatra, K. iiiii.

- (f) Ile bring my soule my selfe, and
that with speede,
My selfe will bring my soule to
Antony.

Cleopatra, I. iiiii.

- (g) She went with such a will.

Cleopatra, K. v.

- (h) And now proude Tyrant *Cæsar* do
thy worst.

Cleopatra, K. iiiii. verso.

- (i) *Charmion*, is this well done? saide
one of them.

Yea, well saide she, and her that
from the race
Of so great Kings descends, doth
best become.

Cleopatra, K. v.

- (j) And in that cheere th' impression
of a smile
Did seeme to shew she scorned
Death and *Cæsar*,
And telling Death how much her
death did please her.

Cleopatra, K. iiiii. verso, K. v.

Thou best of thieves; who with an
easy key,
Dost open life, and unperceiv'd by
us,
Ev'n steal us from ourselves;
discharging so
Death's dreadful office, better than
himself;
Touching our limbs so gently into
slumber.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

Coward flesh,
Wouldst thou conspire with *Cæsar*
to betray me,
As thou wert none of mine?

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

But bring myself my soul to *Antony*.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

I go with such a will to find my
lord.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

Cæsar, thy worst.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

Charmion, is this well done?
Yes, 'tis well done, and like a queen,
the last
Of her great race.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

Th' impression of a smile, left in
her face
Shows she died pleas'd with him
for whom she liv'd.

All for Love, Act v. sc. 1.

ii. Dryden and Milton.

Aubrey* is the authority for the well-known story of Dryden's visit to Milton to obtain permission "to tagge his verses." Dr. Verrall† was of opinion that it is probably apocryphal. This version of it, with additional details, seems to have escaped notice:

"We shall here beg the Readers Pardon for mentioning a Passage told a Gentleman of our Society almost Forty years since by M^r. Dryden,

* *Brief Lives*, ed. Clark, ii. 72.

† *Lectures on Dryden*, 220.

who went with Mr. Waller in Company to make a Visit to Mr. Milton and desire his Leave for putting his *Paradise Lost* into Rhime for the Stage. Well, M^r. Dryden, says Milton, it seems you have a mind to Tagg my Points, and you have my Leave to Tagg 'em, but some of 'em are so Awkward and Old Fashion'd that I think you had as good leave 'em as you found 'em." *The Monitor*, vol. i. numb. 17. From Monday, April 6, to Friday, April 10, 1713.

iii. Dryden and the Duke of Buckingham.

From Dean Lockier, through the medium of the Rev. Joseph Spence,* has come down to us the highly improbable story of the Duke of Buckingham's impromptu ridicule of a line in an unnamed play of Dryden's, which not only resulted in the immediate and total discomfiture of the actress who spoke it, but also damned the play and deprived the poet of the benefit of the third day's performance. No other reference to such an incident is to be found, and one takes leave to doubt whether it ever occurred. The story has been so frequently repeated and discussed that it is curious that no one has noticed the two following passages, which seem to refer to the original line, wherever it appeared, and the rejoinder to it.

The first is to be found in *S' too him Bayes* : Or Some Observations upon the Humour of Writing *Rehearsals Transposed*. Oxon : 1673, 8vo, p. 7. "And, *there was a time* (another *happy time*) *when the Clergy needed no more knowledge then to read the Liturgy.*

(The Wound was great because it was *but small*)
Th'adst been a *Bishop* needed none at all."

The second is in *Notes And Observations On The Empress of Morocco*. 1674, 4to, p. 62.

"His argument runs thus : No Traitor can come within the Sphere of *Morena*, but I can come within the Sphere of *Morena*, therefore I am no Traitor : what could his Father reply to this ; but that *his treason greater was for being small ; And had been greater were it none at all.*"

If this had been founded on what was originally a joke at Dryden's expense, it is extremely unlikely to have made its appearance in a tract of which he was part-author, or, having so appeared, to have been left without comment in *Notes And Observations On*

* Spence's *Anecdotes*, ed. Singer, pp. 61-62.

The Empress of Morocco Revised. One may perhaps be permitted to suggest here that another famous theatrical "impromptu,"

Oh Jemmy Thompson! Jemmy Thompson Oh!

is not altogether free from suspicion; some person may, of course, have delivered himself of it during a performance of Thomson's play, but if he did, I think it most probable that he had previously seen it in *A Criticism On The New Sophonisba*, . . . 1730, which was published within a few days of the first performance.

iv. *Poetical Reflections On A Late Poem Entituled, Absalom and Achitophel. By a Person of Honour*, fol. 1682.

The *Person of Honour*, "according to Antony Wood, was Villiers Duke of Buckingham." This is Malone's statement, made more than once,* which has been accepted without question by all succeeding editors and biographers of Dryden, while Lady Burghclere, who perhaps had access to special sources of information, tells us: †

"Nor did Buckingham confine his indignation to his note-book. The fashionable society of the day eagerly devoured the pamphlet in which he strove to answer the poet's charges. 'Some (*sic*) reflections on a late poem entitled *Absalom and Achitophel*, by a Person of Honour,' sold like wildfire in 1682. But as no less a judge than Sir Walter Scott considered its 'celebrity was rather to be imputed to the rank and reputation of the author than to the merit of the performance,' ‡ it can readily be believed that its extreme rarity, rather than its intrinsic merit, makes it valuable nowadays."

Wood is apt to be unreliable in his statements as to the authorship of poetical tracts; he thought *Azaria and Hushai* was written by Settle, and ascribed *The Tribe of Levi* to Dryden himself—but in this particular case it is but due to him to refer to what he actually does say, § which is—

"However it was, sure I am that the Duke of Bucks did not cause him (Dryden) to be beaten, but wrote, or caused to be wrote, *Reflections on the said Poem called Absalom and Achitophel*, which being printed on a sheet of paper, was, tho' no great matter in it, sold very dear. In which the author commends those that Mr. Dryden discommends, and discommends those which he commends."

* *Life of Dryden*, 1800, p. 36 and p. 157.

† *George Villiers*, 1903, pp. 260-261.

‡ *Dryden's Works*, ix. 273.

§ *Ath. Ox.* ed. Bliss. iv. 210.

It will be noticed that Wood makes no such positive statement as Malone's note suggests, and his description of the size of the tract induces one to think that he had never seen it.

The weight of Scott's judgment is not needed to fortify one in describing these *Reflections* as drivel, and it is very difficult to understand how any one who had struggled through the piece could contemplate the possibility of its production being in any, even the slightest, degree due to George Villiers, who, disreputable black-guard as he was, was admitted on all hands to be a man of wit and ability. In this connexion, moreover, what Dryden himself says must not be overlooked: "The character of *Zimri*," he writes,* "in my *Absalom*, is in my Opinion, worth the whole Poem: 'Tis not bloody, but 'tis ridiculous enough. And he for whom it was intended was too witty to regard it as an injury." If the Duke had been in any way responsible for the *Reflections*, it is improbable that Dryden would not have been aware of the fact, and being aware of it, he could hardly have written as he has, unless indeed it is to be said that *Zimri* had only one way of resenting such an injury open to him, that is by means of personal violence.

The Miscellaneous Works of His Grace, George Villiers, Late Duke of Buckingham were published in various editions from 1704 onwards, and though the volumes in which they appeared were filled with all sorts of odds and ends of other people's composition, this piece was never included among them. My own copy of it has inscribed on the title-page in a contemporary hand, "Howard Esqr.": it is more than likely that "dull Ned," one of Dryden's brothers-in-law, was the author of it.

v. Dryden's Pecuniary Circumstances.

Curious inquiries, involving calculations as to the contemporary value of money and of guineas in particular, have been made into Dryden's financial position at various periods of his life. I have in my possession the original "Book of Expenses" of Thomas, son of Sir Robert Howard, Dryden's nephew by marriage, in which, under date "Jan. 16, 169 $\frac{1}{2}$ " is this entry:

"P^d Lady Elizabeth Driden in Charitye . . . 005.00.00."

* *Juvenal*, 1693, Dedication, p. lii.

(To be continued.)

THE RIGHTS OF BEESTON AND D'AVENANT IN ELIZABETHAN PLAYS

By ALLARDYCE NICOLL

ON the re-opening of the theatres in 1660, several dramatic companies sprang into existence, eager to recapture some of the glories of the Caroline stage cruelly shattered by Cromwell and his satellites. As is well known, these companies, within a few years, were reduced to two, the King's men under Killigrew, playing at Vere Street and at Bridges Street, and the servants of the King's brother, the Duke of York, under D'Avenant, playing at Salisbury Court and at Lincoln's Inn Fields. The theatrical history of the first few years of the Restoration period is exceedingly confused, but it is evident that Killigrew's actors, some of whom were relics of the old King's men of the pre-Commonwealth period, regarded themselves as the direct heirs of that company which, since the time of Shakespeare, had dominated the dramatic activities of London. D'Avenant, on the other hand, seems to have regarded his men as the descendants of that "young company of players" of which he had been created governor in the year 1640. This young company, however, had, immediately before 1640, been under the direction of William Beeston. It was William Beeston who in 1660 was the proprietor of the playhouse in Salisbury Court, and from him, accordingly, D'Avenant leased the theatre when he started acting there.

The relations between the two later and the two earlier companies become of vital importance when we pause to consider the repertoires of each. On August 10, 1639, Lord Pembroke issued an order to the masters of all theatres other than the Cockpit, in which Beeston's young company was performing, commanding them on no account to act any of the plays belonging to that band of players, an order, it has been suggested, called forth by the fact that Beaumont and Fletcher's *Monsieur Thomas* (or *Fathers owne Sonne*) seems to have

been seized upon by the King's men.* The list of plays "appropriated" includes some forty-four dramas, mostly the legacies of then defunct companies. For comparison with this there is, happily, another list dated August 7, 1641, detailing sixty comedies and tragedies which were the sole property of the King's men.† Here the plays of Shakespeare and Ben Jonson are not included, and their omission may be taken as indicating that the dramas detailed in the list are only those which so far had not found their way into print.

When acting was re-started in 1660 there seems to have been still some vague sense of proprietary ownership of the older plays; and this vague sense was crystallised by warrants issuing from the Lord Chamberlain's office, defining with greater or less accuracy the dramas authorised to be performed by the several companies. On December 12, 1660, a short list of plays allotted to D'Avenant was issued; on August 20, 1668, there was provided a lengthier enumeration of his dramas; and about January 12, 1668-9, was drawn up "A Catalogue of part of His Ma^{ties} Servants Playes as they were formerly acted at the Blackfryers & now allowed of to his Ma^{ties} Servants at y^e New Theatre."‡ The last of these three documents enumerates no less than 108 plays in all, but among them are to be found many of the works of Jonson and Shakespeare. Of the former, there is included *Every Man in his Humour*, *Every Man out of his Humour*, *Cynthia's Revels*, *Sejanus*, *The Fox*, *The Silent Woman*, *The Alchemist*, *Catiline*, *Bartholomew Fair*, *The Staple of News*, *The Devil is an Ass*, *The Magnetic Lady*, *The Tale of a Tub*, and *The New Inn*—fourteen in all; of the latter, *The Winter's Tale*, *King John*, *Richard II.*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *As You Like It*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *All's Well that Ends Well*, *Henry IV.* (both parts), *Richard III.*, *Coriolanus*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Julius Caesar*, *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Cymbeline*—twenty-one

* This list is to be found in the Public Record Office, L.C.5/134, p. 337. For the suggestion regarding *Monsieur Thomas*, see Mr. E. K. Chambers' article on *Plays of the King's Men in 1641* (*Malone Society Collections*; i. 4 and 5, p. 364) and his *Elizabethan Stage*, iii. 228.

† Public Record Office, L.C.5/96; printed in *Malone Society Collections*; i. 4 and 5, pp. 367-369.

‡ These three lists are all in the Public Record Office; L.C.5/137, p. 343; L.C.5/139, p. 375, and L.C.5/12; L.C.5/12, p. 202. They have been printed in the present writer's *History of Restoration Drama*, pp. 314-316.

plays. The Jonson and Shakespeare entries together, therefore, account for thirty-five in the list, leaving seventy-three. Of these seventy-three, thirty-eight appear in the 1641 document mentioned above. The "Beaumont and Fletcher" dramas are represented by *The Beggar's Bush*, *Bonduca*, *The Custom of the Country*, *The Captain*, *The Chances*, *The Coxcomb*, *The Double Marriage*, *The Little French Lawyer*, *The Humorous Lieutenant*, *The Island Princess*, *The Knight of Malta*, *The Loyal Subject*, *The Lover's Progress*, *Love's Pilgrimage*, *The Noble Gentleman*, *The Prophetess*, *The Martial Maid*, *The Pilgrim*, *The Queen of Corinth*, *The Spanish Curate*, *Valentinian*, *The Woman's Prize*, *A Wife for a Month*, and *The Wild Goose Chase*—twenty-four pieces, as against the twenty-seven of the earlier list, the omissions being *The Mad Lover*, *The Maid of the Mill*, and *The Honest Man's Fortune*. In the first two of these D'Avenant had been given a two months' right in December, 1660, the plays thereafter evidently becoming common to both the companies, and in August, 1668, he was allowed full right in the third. Fourteen plays duplicated in the pre-Restoration and in the Restoration lists, as will be seen, remain to be accounted for. Of these, the three plays of Shirley, *The Doubtful Heir*, *The Imposture*, and *The Brothers*, appear in both unchanged. *The Duke of Lerma* of 1669 is no doubt "The Duke of Lerma or y^e spanish Duke" of 1641, a non-extant play of Henry Shirley's. *Alphonsus* is the only "Chapman" work in both, but only two of the three Massinger plays, *The Guardian* and *The Bashful Lover*, are given in the later list, *The City Madam* being omitted. Suckling's *Brennoralt* and *The Goblins*, Newcastle's *The Country Captain*, Brome's *The Novella* and Middleton's *More Dissemblers besides Women*, *The Mayor of Quinborough*, and *The Widow*, all remain.

The omissions in the 1669 list can be easily classed under two headings. There are, in the first place, plays which must have disappeared in the intervening twenty-eight years. Arthur Wilson's *The Swisser*, *The Inconstant Lady*, and *The Corporal* may be included here, as well as Brome's *The Love-Sick Maid*, Ford's *Beauty in a Trance*, Tourneur's *The Nobleman*, and Massinger's *Alexius*, *The Forc'd Lady*, *The Judge*, and *Minerva's Sacrifice*. It is noticeable that, with one exception, all the plays noted by Mr. E. K. Chambers as being non-extant or else preserved in some MS. form are absent in the document of 1669; the Commonwealth era had evidently told heavily on the fortunes of the dramatic works of the

time.* Besides these, however, a few plays are omitted because of their having been given over to D'Avenant, along with *The Mad Lover*, *The Maid of the Mill* and *The Honest Man's Fortune*. Quite naturally, that dramatist's own *Unfortunate Lovers*, *The Fair Favourite*, *The Distresses*, *Love and Honour*, and *News from Plymouth* passed into his own hands (in December, 1660), as did one or two other dramas undoubtedly belonging to the King's men but not mentioned in their 1641 list. Carlell's *The Passionate Lovers*, like Massinger's *The City Madam*, seem simply to have disappeared, possibly because these dramas were not considered worth reviving on the stage.

The 1669 list, however, compensates for its omissions by adding a number of other dramas, practically all of which must have belonged to the pre-Commonwealth King's company. Of the "Beaumont and Fletcher" plays, we find *The False One* and *The Fair Maid of the Inn* (both printed in 1647), *The Laws of Candy* and *The Sea Voyage*, which had been entered in the Stationer's Register under the date September 4, 1646, as well as *The Elder Brother*, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, *A King and No King*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, *Philaster*, *Rollo*, *The Scornful Lady*, *Thierry and Theodoret*, and *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, which were omitted from the 1641 list, no doubt, because they had been already printed. The other additions include plays of Cartwright (*The Royal Slave*), Shirley (*The Sisters*, *The Cardinal*), Massinger (*The Unnatural Combat*, *The Duke of Milan*, *The Emperor of the East*, *The Fatal Dowry*, *The Roman Actor*), Suckling (*Aglaure*), Carlell (*Arviragus and Philicia*, *The Deserving Favourite*, *Osmond the Great Turk*), Newcastle (*The Variety*), Berkeley (*The Lost Lady*), Chapman (*Bussy d'Ambois*, *The Widow's Tears*), and Brome (*The Northern Lass*). All of these, with the exception of *The Variety* (printed 1649), and *Osmond* (printed 1657), had been published before 1641, and all, with the exception of *Bussy d'Ambois* (an original Paul's play),† *The Faithful Shepherdess* (originally Queen's Revels),‡ *Osmond* (Queen's), and *The Widow's Tears* (Black and Whitefriars), seem to have been brought out originally by the King's men.

* It may be noted here that possibly one other drama is common to the two. *The Bridegroom and the Madman* (1641) is no doubt to be identified with *The Nice Valour*, or *The Passionate Madman* (1669), another of the Beaumont and Fletcher group.

† But given later by the King's men (Adams, *Henry Herbert*, 55 and 76; cf. Murry, J. T., *English Dramatic Companies*, i. 177).

‡ Revived by King's men in 1633 (Adams, *op. cit.* 20).

This somewhat lengthy consideration of the correspondences between the two lists of plays belonging to the King's players may form a background for the more interesting analysis of the plays given over to D'Avenant in 1660 and in 1668. The warrant of the former year presents him with nine plays of Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, *Measure for Measure*, *Much Ado about Nothing*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Twelfth Night*, *Henry VIII.*, *Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Hamlet*, besides allowing him two months' use of *Pericles*. Besides these, he obtained Denham's *The Sophy*, a King's men's play not printed till 1642, but peculiarly left out of the 1641 list, and Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, another King's men's tragedy, but rightly omitted from the list since it had been published in 1623. It has been noted above that a two months' right was given him in *The Mad Lover* and *The Maid of the Mill*; to these and *Pericles* may be added *The Spanish Curate*, *The Loyal Subject*, and *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*. The 1668 warrant provides a different set of plays altogether. Those of 1660 had been, without exception, plays originally in the possession of the King's men; these of 1668 mostly belonged to other sets of actors, and several came from the Cockpit company of 1639. Thus Beaumont and Fletcher's *Cupid's Revenge* and Chapman's *Chabot Admiral of France* appear in the 1639 list, the first having belonged to the Queen's Revels and later to the Lady Elizabeth's men,* and the second in all probability to the former company.† Besides these, we know that Shirley's *The Bird in a Cage* was an original Cockpit play. Markham's *Herod and Antipater* was given first by the Red Bull company of the King's Revels, while Day's *Humour out of Breath* and Mason's *Mulleasses* were owned by the Children of His Majesty's Revels. Jonson's *Poetaster* was published in 1602 as acted by the Children of the Chapel, Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Woman Hater* in 1607 as acted by the Children of Pauls (although it was being given by the King's men later ‡); Chapman's *All Fools* and *The Conspiracy of Charles Duke of Byron* are early Blackfriars plays, and his *Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* was presented at the Whitefriars. Randolph's *The Jealous Lovers* was a Cambridge drama; Chapman's (or Glapthorne's) *The Revenge for Honour* was licensed to the Prince's men in 1624.§ There remain the three Shakespeare dramas (*Timon of Athens*, *Troilus and Cressida*,

* Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, iii. 225.

† It was licensed later as Shirley's (Adams, *op. cit.* 36).

‡ As in the edition of 1648.

§ Adams, *op. cit.* 28.

and the three parts of *Henry VI.*) as well as four Beaumont and Fletcher plays (*The Honest Man's Fortune*, *Women Pleased*, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, and *Wit at Several Weapons*), two of Ford's (*The Broken Heart* and *The Lover's Melancholy*), all of which were associated with the King's men.*

In collecting his plays at the time of the Restoration D'Avenant seems to have culled them from three separate sources. He evidently took over from Beeston, or held in his own right, many of the "Cockpitt plays appropriated" in 1639. To the list given above might be added Massinger's *The Bondman*, Heywood's *Love's Mistress*, and Shirley's *The Grateful Servant*, *The Witty Fair One*, and *The School of Compliment*, all of which we know from other sources to have been acted in the first years of the Restoration period either at Salisbury Court or at Lincoln's Inn Fields, and all included in the Cockpit list. D'Avenant was enabled, moreover, to secure a number of dramas which had originally been produced by children's companies or by companies other than that serving the King. Most important of all, he seized upon some of the most popular pieces of the King's men themselves. It certainly seems strange that he should thus have been able to purloin what obviously were among the most taking plays of that time, and still more strange that the Lord Chamberlain and the King should have supported him by their warrants. What, we may well ask, was the justification for granting him these rights? Autocratically as Charles II. behaved in regard to the theatres, we can hardly believe that he wilfully alienated a number of the best of Shakespeare's plays from those who were after all his own servants; and the problem arises of discovering some reason underlying the two warrants. There are no other documents here to assist us; but there seems to be a clue, never followed out, to be discovered in the texts of some of the plays in question. Of these plays a number were reprinted in the period of the Restoration, notably *The Tempest* (in D'Avenant's and Dryden's alteration), *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado about Nothing* (in D'Avenant's own composite adaptation), *Macbeth* (in 1673, and as an opera in 1674), *Hamlet*, and *The Duchess of Malfi*. *The Law against Lovers*, which unites parts of *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado about Nothing*, may be dismissed, as the alterations

* *The Honest Man's Fortune* seems to have been produced by the Lady Elizabeth's men, but was later licensed to the King's company (Chambers, *op. cit.* iii. 227). The introduction of *The Faithful Shepherdess* in both the lists is an exception which presupposes some error.

made in the text make comparison with the original Folio versions impossible; but *The Tempest*, in the original 1670 version, the first (1673) edition of the "D'Avenant" *Macbeth*, before that play like *The Tempest* had been metamorphosed out of all likeness to the original, and *Hamlet* afford material for some possible conjecture. Elsewhere I have attempted a brief examination of the texts of the 1676 *Hamlet* and of the 1673 *Macbeth*,* and have come to the conclusion that both point back, not to printed originals, but to prompt-copies of the pre-Commonwealth period. This conclusion is arrived at from an examination of several facts: (1) that in neither play does one single Quarto or Folio seem to have been the original, readings being taken from various sources; † (2) that the *Macbeth* quarto gives the full text of those songs, the first lines only of which appear in the First Folio; (3) that the *Hamlet* quarto has excisions which seem more probably executed in the period before 1642 than in that after 1660. In *The Tempest* of 1670 only one act is left in something like its Shakespearian state, and, as a consequence, this play does not furnish such a sure basis for investigation. Yet even in this restricted field there are again indications that the original before Dryden and D'Avenant was a prompt-copy. A close examination of the speeches retained from the original play reveals the fact that there are readings occasionally from the First Folio, occasionally from the Second or from the Third. Sometimes, even, the text of the Dryden-D'Avenant adaptation points to an original which is more authentic than any of those three. It is manifest, for example, that the lines beginning:

"Abhorred Slaue,
Which any print of goodnesse wilt not take,"

cannot have been intended for Miranda, as they are given in the Folio, and the Dryden-D'Avenant "attribution" of them to Prospero has been followed by every later editor.

The Tempest, therefore, *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*, as printed in the time of the Restoration, all point back to some texts independent of the Folios and the previous Quartos. The conclusion to which this examination of the three Restoration play-lists along with those of 1639 and 1641 and along with an analysis of these Shakespeare

* See an essay on *Shakespeare's Editors from First Folio to Malone*, the last of a series of *First Folio Tercentenary Lectures*, shortly to be published by the Oxford University Press.

† This is particularly true of the 1673 *Macbeth*; a corrected quarto may have been used for the 1676 *Hamlet*.

plays would tend is that D'Avenant, who seems all through the Commonwealth period to have been eager to recommence dramatic performances, together with Beeston, who during the period of theatre suppression made himself proprietor of the Salisbury Court playhouse in anticipation of happier days to come, secured the possession of a number of prompt-books belonging originally to the King's men, and by virtue of the possession of these the former contrived to get a royal warrant in 1660, declaring that he might have those dramas as the property of his company. The only definite item of proof against this theory of which I am aware is that the 1678 quarto of *The Duchess of Malfi* is but a modernised reprint of the quarto of 1640; but even this does not necessarily establish the non-existence of an original prompt-text in D'Avenant's hands. It is, at all events, possible that the printer here used for convenience a printed text instead of utilising a theatre copy, no doubt presenting matter much more difficult to set up satisfactorily.*

The warrants of 1660, 1668, and 1669 are thus seen to have a very definite interest as proving the continuity of Elizabethan ideas concerning the ownership of plays, and, if the conclusion set forth above be in any way accepted, they serve to put more of intrinsic importance on those late quarto texts which critics in the past have been inclined to regard rather as literary curiosities than as possible sources of information in a determination of the true text of Shakespeare.

* It is noticeable that while *The Tempest* was published by Cademan, *Hamlet* by Martyn and Herringman, and *Macbeth* by Herringman, *The Duchess of Malfi* was described as printed by D. N. and T. C., and sold by Simon Neale. It is probable that the publication of the last was not authorised by the actors.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

A POEM ATTRIBUTED TO PRIOR

An Epistle from the Elector of Bavaria to the French King : After the Battel of Ramillies (Tonson, 1706), has been traditionally ascribed to Prior. A. R. Waller was inclined to accept the attribution. I think it can be disproved on two grounds.

(1) The opening sentences of the Dedicatory Epistle to the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal make it clear that the writer was a lawyer. "None of the Profession, over which Your Lordship presides, ought to appear in Verse, without asking Pardon of Your Lordship for the Transgression."

(2) I have recently examined a volume of folio poems in which a different attribution is given. This volume, which was lately sold along with others of the same provenance, contains the armorial bookplate of a John Plumtre. The arms are those of the well-known Nottingham family; and there can be little doubt that the original owner, who has written his name on a number of the pieces, was that John Plumtre who is mentioned by Nichols as having been member for Nottingham in several parliaments. If so, he was likely to be well informed; and the contents of the volume suggest that he was a judicious person. It contains some five and twenty poetical pamphlets: epicedes on the death of Dryden; poems celebrating the victories of Marlborough; satirical pieces; and a few elegant trifles, including Prior's *To a Young Gentleman in Love* and Philips's ode *Ad Henricum St. John*. The dated pieces are all between 1700 and 1708, except one which is 1690.

On several of the pieces the original owner has written the author's name: On this piece he has written "John Plumtre the Gift of y^e Author" and "By Stephen Clay Esq." Stephen Clay (as I learn from Foster's *Alumni* and the *Calendar of the Inner Temple Records*) was a demy of Magdalen, 1690-1702, and was called to the bar November 24, 1700. Sir Charles Frith tells me

that there are poems by him in the Miscellaneous Works of the Earl of Roscommon, 1709, pp. 162, 164.

Other attributions in the volume, which may possibly be of interest, are :

Corona Civica. A Poem, to the Right Honourable the Lord Keeper . . . 1706. "By y^e Rev. Mr. Vernon."

To the Right Honourable Sir George Rooke. . . . At His Return from His Glorious Enterprize near Vigo. 1702. "By Charles Tooke."

R. W. CHAPMAN.

AN INEDITED MS. OF FORD'S *FAMES MEMORIAL*L

John Ford's poem *Fames Memoriall, or the Earle of Devonshire Deceased*, etc., was first published in 1606, with a dedication to the widowed Countess—Penelope Rich, the "Stella" of Sidney's sonnets—of whom the youthful poet was a warm partisan. It was next reprinted by Haslewood in 1819, and was included in the editions of Ford's works by Gifford and Dyce in 1827 and 1869 respectively, and in the reissue of Dyce's edition in 1895. Though its poetry is mostly of the dullest, the personal allusions it contains and the sidelights it throws on the temperament and ideas of the author, lend some interest to the piece.

It apparently escaped the notice of Dyce that Malone in his essay on "Shakespeare, Jonson, and Ford" * had stated that he possessed "the original presentation copy" of *Fames Memoriall*. Malone's MS., which is now in the Bodleian Library (Malone Collection), contains (*inter alia*) the following note in his hand :

Apparently the author's presentation copy, 1606. This is a great curiosity, as it furnishes an exact specimen of the handwriting in which all Shakespeare's plays were written out for the press, except that they probably were not written near so neatly. E.M.

The MS., which is indeed admirably written, is presumably a holograph ; for while it is most unlikely that Ford (then a law student only twenty years of age) would have wasted money on getting his poem copied, it is still less likely that any one but the author would have struggled through the task of copying his

* Boswell's Malone's *Shakespeare*, vol. i. (1821).

interminable stanzas without the hope of worldly gain. But it is certainly neat enough for the work of a professional copyist.

In many instances the Malone MS. corrects misprints and mis-readings in the printed editions; and while it lacks the terrible acrostic preface, it contains three stanzas addressed to the Countess of Devonshire which were omitted on its publication. The omission was assuredly not due to their poor quality—for they are no worse than many others in this immense elegy—but was doubtless dictated merely by motives of prudence; the stanzas were perhaps deemed to be too fervent in their defence of the virtue of the fallen and scandal-smirched lady whom Ford (though only in the MS.) extols for patiently bearing “spleenes *unjust disgrace*.”*

The following are the suppressed stanzas : †

Lyue thou untoucht forever aboue fame,
more happie yt thou canst not be more haplesse !
The wordes of malice are an usuall game,
whose mouth is lawlesse, whose intention saplesse,
Their breast of hony tornes to poison paplesse.
Still be thine eares to sufferance tun'd readie,
in mynde resolu'd, in resolution steadie.

What hee amongst the proudest of contempt
Whiles as thy sunshine lasted, did not bend
Unto thy posture. Flattery redempt
Wth service on their seruice did attend,
all stryving to admire, protest, commend,
Wth now by imputation black as hell
they seeme to derogate from dooing well.

Thy virtue caus'd thy honor to support thee
in noble contract of undoubted merit.
His knowledge to his Credence did report thee
a creature of a more then female sperit;
Concord of musick did thy soule inherite.
Courtiers but counterfeit thy rarity
for thy perfections brook't no parity.

Among the minor differences between MS. and printed copy is the name of the poet's “flint-hearted” mistress, whom he upbraids as “Lucia” in the former, whereas she appears in print as “Lycia.” ‡ But it is possible that this lady was introduced merely for fashion's sake, much as Daniel not many years previously had dragged his cruel “Delia” into the famous *Complaint of Rosamond*, which was certainly read by Ford.

* Lady Rich was divorced for adultery in 1605, and married the Earl of Devonshire (her co-respondent) shortly before his death in 1606.

† Their place if printed would have been after stanza 3 on p. 308 of vol. iii. of Ford's *Works* (edn. 1895, ed. by Gifford and Dyce).

‡ Ford's *Works*, edn. 1895 (vol. i. pp. 297 and 322).

The dedication prefixed to the MS. also varies somewhat from that ultimately published. Whether it ever reached the Countess's hands, it is impossible to say ; but the following interesting passage from the MS. clearly explains the purpose of that excellent piece of calligraphy :

Yet ere I committed it [*i.e.* the poem] to the presse (for fame undivulged is an hidden Minerall) being unknowne unto you I might have been imputed as much impudent as fond, if I had not first presented it to your milder view : Earnest to understand whether your acceptation and liking may privileged the passe under your honorable conduct : w^{ch} if it may I shall deeme my willing paines (though hitherto confined to the Inns of Court, a Studie different) highly guerdoned, and myne unfeathered Muse richlie graced wth y^e plumes of soe worthie a protectresse.

This dedication is signed in a clear Italian hand, "John Ford," despite the fact that the surname was printed as *Forde* in the edition of 1606. This is a point worth noting because there has always been some uncertainty about the correct spelling. J. P. Collier, in his Shakespeare Society reprints of Ford, strongly insisted on the necessity of retaining the final *e* ; and in this he has been followed by other scholars, notably by Professor W. Bang-Kaup, in whose excellent Louvain reprints of Ford's plays the name is printed "*Forde*" *passim*. But Ford, with his legal training and profession, must have been a skilled penman ; and since only two of his signatures are known to exist, and neither contains a final *e*, it is obvious that the commonly accepted spelling of his name ought to become the universally accepted one.

BERTRAM LLOYD.

MATTHEW STEVENSON

The D.N.B. is not able to be more precise with regard to his dates than "*f.* 1654-1685," the latter apparently inserted upon the ground that there was a reissue of his poems, under the title of *The Wits*, in that year. I think the following entry in the register of S. Mary in the Marsh, Norwich, relates to his burial :—

"Stevenson, Matthew b. 20 March 1683" (*i.e.* 1683 $\frac{1}{2}$).

G. T.-D.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TWO STAGES, . . . 1702

Malone, who has been followed by others, down to and including M. Paul Dottin in his recently published reprint of *Robinson Crusoe Examined and Criticised*, ascribes this book to Gildon. I should be glad to be told what, if any, evidence there is to support such an attribution, which seems to me quite incredible. The author loses no opportunity of abusing the players, an indulgence which a practising dramatist, as Gildon was, is hardly likely to have allowed himself, and, in particular, goes out of his way to attack the private character of Mrs. Bracegirdle, to whom Gildon had expressed his acknowledgments for her "admirable Action" in the preface before his *Love's Victim*, in the preceding year.

In the course of the *Comparison* it is proposed to examine the then recent plays, but one of the interlocutors protests that the very memory of 'em gives his stomach the puke; the examination is consequently confined to a brief enumeration, and among those lumped together, "*cum multis aliis quæ nunc*—and so forth—all Damn'd, every Son and Daughter for ever," is (Gildon's) *Phaeton* (p. 32). A little later on (p. 54), "*Etheridge, Dryden, Wicherly, Otway, Congreve and Vanbrug*" are mentioned as "extraordinary men" that "the latter part of this Age has produced," these names are immediately contrasted with *D—s, D—y, G—n, S—e, B—y*, and the speaker concludes "but above all, commend me to the ingenious Author of the *Trip to the Jubilee*." I have not learned that excess of modesty was characteristic of Gildon so that he would be apt to include himself among inferior writers, and I am unwilling to believe that he would treat a man with insolent contempt, as Farquhar is treated in this book, and accept from him an Epilogue for his play *The Patriot* in the following year.

G. T.-D.

REVIEWS

The Elizabethan Stage. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1923. 4 vols. (i, xli+388 pp.; ii, 557 pp.; iii, 518 pp.; iv, 467 pp.). 70s.

FOR twenty years past it has been the habit to refer to Dr. Chambers' "great work on the Mediaeval Stage"; we may now refer to his greater work on the Elizabethan Stage. It is indeed a splendid achievement, this cyclopaedia of the whole of the material side of the vast growth of the English drama from the accession of the Virgin Queen to the death of Shakespeare, in four goodly and packed volumes. Progressing leisurely through the author's pages—for, excellent as literature, they hardly form light reading—one grows ever more impressed at once with the amplitude of the subject and the mastery of the treatment. And if any one should feel inclined here and there to question the relevance of the discussion, let him remember that, apart from the constitution of the royal household, the position and activities of the Lord Chamberlain and his subordinate Master of the Revels, and with them much of the theatrical history of the times, are unintelligible; and without a topographical and architectural survey of the Blackfriars property no adequate account can be given of the playhouses that were formed within its walls. At the same time few literary students are likely to digest the chapters in which these questions are treated, and should any misguided pedant think them fit subjects for examination, I rejoice that I am unlikely to be among his victims.

Dr. Chambers' work is one of those which perhaps no living person is in a position to criticise adequately. Specialists will doubtless examine it closely, bit by bit, and may detect flaws in the structure. Meanwhile it is perhaps some tribute to the solidity with which the author has built that, in those comparatively restricted portions with regard to which I am in any way qualified to offer an opinion, our points of disagreement should be so few and generally trivial.

The work is carried down to the year 1616. It is impossible not to regret that the history from that perhaps arbitrary date to the Civil War still remains unwritten. True it is that this may be the furthest limit to which the term "Elizabethan" can with propriety be stretched; but though conditions changed they changed slowly and continuously. There is no such break between Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline drama, as between these and the Mediaeval on the one hand and the Restoration on the other. At the same time we have been waiting twenty years for the present instalment; we must have waited appreciably longer for the continuation, and I do not think I am giving voice to mere impatience if I say that we could not afford to do so. The interest in the early stage and early drama was never keener or more widespread than now; new lines of approach are constantly being opened up, and these lead to new theories that require to be brought to the touchstone of ascertained fact. Hitherto, with only Collier and Fleay, apart from minor works, to guide us, we have been groping in a jungle or picking our way across a morass, often both at once. Now at last we know where we stand: we know the general structure and outline of the subject, the hard skeleton of fact with which our more fleshy reconstructions have to conform. The gain is enormous and most opportune.

But that does not mean that we should give up hope for the future. I for one look forward eagerly to seeing the quarter of a century that lies between the death of Shakespeare and the death of the stage he knew mapped out on a similar scale by Dr. Chambers or under his inspiration. First, however, I want to see that "little book about Shakespeare" for which these six mighty volumes in maroon and green are the prolegomena. That we already ask for more marks our appreciation of what we have received.

And how good it is! There is an epic quality in the story. As Dr. Chambers sees it, the history of the Elizabethan stage at its most critical period is the struggle of the Court and Humanism on the one part against the City and Puritanism on the other, and it was the final triumph of the former under the guidance of Tudor statesmanship that, not indeed produced the genius of Shakespeare, but conditioned its manifestation as the crowning blossom of what the world has come to regard, perhaps rightly, as one of its supreme achievements in literature. On the narrower issue Dr. Chambers writes: "The history of play-licensing in London . . . really

turns upon an attempt of the Corporation, goaded by the preachers, to convert their power of regulating plays into a power of suppressing plays, as the ultimate result of which even the power of regulation was lost to them, and the central government, acting through the Privy Council and the system of patents, with the Master of the Revels as a licenser, took the supervision of the stage into its own hands." It is fascinating to watch the details of the struggle. What folly it must have seemed to the cultured statesmen of Elizabeth's Council, sharing no doubt the ironic sanity of Sir Thomas More, when the Puritan Corporation insisted on seeing the hand of an avenging God in the collapse of any rotten scaffold. And at the same time how strangely ineffective their own thunders appear sometimes to have been. In 1581 they took the important step of entrusting all play-licensing to the Master of the Revels, yet a few months later they were still urging the Corporation to appoint fit persons for the purpose. After fifteen years they ordered "the complete gutting of the theatres," but, instead of consternation in dramatic circles, we find Henslowe quietly reconstructing his company in the confident and justified belief that the restraint was a purely passing inconvenience! Elizabeth, high-handed as her methods were, understood the importance of government by consent, and won it. The Tudor period closes with an established equilibrium and the stage a recognised member of the body politic. It was due to the extravagance and incompetence, the blindness and licence, of the Stuart regime that in the space of forty years the verdict was reversed and the stage swallowed up in the general debacle. The story of that defeat is not told here. But already we see the straws flying and catch the murmurs of the gathering storm. Provincial towns are closing their gates on players, with the legal support of a Chief Justice: soon the Privy Council will grant licence for such exclusion—a sop to Cerberus.

But for the most part the implicit drama of theatrical history is felt rather than seen as a background to the orderly chronicle of events. Dr. Chambers can wield a weighty pen upon occasion, but here he sticks closely to business, and the reader is seldom allowed to enjoy the flowing periods of a heightened style. A deliberate austerity reigns, which apparently even forbids reference (i. 164) to the pictorial embellishments of his own volumes. Nor is the subject one that lends itself readily to humour; it is rare to catch more than the flicker of a smile on the author's lips. There is,

indeed, a dry pungency in the way he dismisses a conjecture that "the company at Aberdeen [in 1603] was the Chamberlain's men . . . that Shakespeare was with them, and that he picked up local colour, to the extent of 'a blasted heath' for *Macbeth*." There is, perhaps, a spice of malice in the remark: "I am glad to have an opportunity for once of defending Collier, even if it is only against Fleay"; and I may add that since the appearance of these volumes Mr. W. J. Lawrence has for once successfully defended Collier against Dr. Chambers also. But these are rare coruscations on the severe architectonic style of the work. The great qualities that stand out in it are the grasp of all relevant evidence, the orderly planning, the almost unfailing lucidity of exposition, and last but not least a caution which may be described as monumental.

The four volumes of Dr. Chambers' work are divided into five books and twenty-four chapters; there are thirteen appendices and four indexes. The First Book is entitled "The Court," and Chapter I. on "Elizabeth and James" gives a most entertaining account of the routine of court life through the seasons as affecting the dramatic and other entertainments of the sovereign. To this belongs Appendix A., "A Court Calendar," giving in astonishing detail the movements and engagements of the court from 17 November, 1558, to 23 April, 1616. Chapter II., "The Royal Household," is introductory to III., "The Revels Office," the records of which are summarised in Appendix B. Further chapters trace the development of (IV.) "Pageantry," (V.-VI.) "The Mask," as Dr. Chambers decides that it is to be spelt, and (VII.) "The Court Play."

The Second Book is called "The Control of the Stage." It opens with a chapter (VIII.) on "Humanism and Puritanism," tracing the struggle on its intellectual side, to which is appended a copious body of "Documents of Criticism" extracted from contemporary writings. The political and social aspect of the controversy informs (IX.) "The Struggle of Court and City," a chapter of quite peculiar excellence, in which the interplay of forces is followed in great detail. To it belongs the invaluable collection of "Documents of Control" in Appendix D. The remaining chapters (X.-XI.) of the book deal with the rather more discursive topics of "The Actor's Quality," that is his profession, and "The Actor's Economics," namely the financial organisation of the same. In the former one rather misses any attempt to appraise the histrionic

methods and talent of the time, Dr. Chambers apparently regarding the art of acting on the stage as no less outside his province than the art of writing for it. The other chapter of course is based largely on Henslowe's records, and contrasts his methods with the more communistic ways of the Chamberlain's men. By the way, is there any confirmation of Platter's curious gossip (ii. 365) as to the source of the players' wardrobes?

The Third Book is devoted to the theatrical companies of the period, or rather to such as are traceable in London. With the sixty or more purely provincial companies Dr. Chambers is not directly concerned. Chapter XII. treats of "The Boy Companies," eleven in number. Of these the Children of Paul's and the Children of the Chapel are, of course, the most important, but some curiosity at least may be allowed the Children of her Majesty's Chamber of Bristol (c. 1615), to which were attached John Daniel, brother of the poet, and the restless actor whom Dr. Chambers calls Martin Slater, but whose real name must, I think, have been Slaughter. "The Adult Companies" are treated in Chapter XIII., and number no less than twenty-four. Several, of course, are of small account, and from the general ruck only four rise to eminence, the Queen's men earlier, and later the Chamberlain-King's, the Admiral-Prince's, and (never of the same rank) the Worcester-Queen's men.

My interest in Father Henslowe here tempts me to comment, but most of the points I should like to discuss I must reserve for another occasion. Only two or three can be taken now. I am not quite certain that Dr. Chambers is right when he says, discussing the restraint of 1597, that Henslowe got "the licence for his house renewed, even before the formal expiration of the restraint on 1 November." I fancy that the release of the delinquents on 3 October emboldened the Admiral's men to anticipate the formal removal of the inhibition, and that they were forced to desist. But the evidence, I admit, is obscure. Again, of the cast for *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, published by "Dramaticus," Dr. Chambers remarks: "Fleay and Greg unite in condemning this communication as an obvious forgery; but I rather wish they had given their reasons." I should have thought that any list of the Admiral's men between 1597 and 1602 including four otherwise unrecorded members of the company was open to suspicion, and that one that assigned three out of four female parts to grown men stood

self-condemned. As regards the performance of Shakespeare's *Richard II.* on the eve of the Essex rising, I am not sure that the actors were quite as innocent as they made out. Great stress was laid on the piece being "so old and so long out of use" as explaining the gratuity received for the performance, but it was not in fact an *exoleta tragoedia*, and it is least possible that they were aware of some risk involved.

Chapter XIV. on "International Companies," after brief treatment of the Italian players in England and the English players in Scotland, traces in detail the fortunes of the bands of English actors who made the continent their hunting ground. Their main preserves were Germany (including Austria), the Netherlands, and Denmark; they seem to have left little trace in France; to Sweden, Poland, Italy, and Spain they just penetrated. The history of their wanderings is of some dramatic importance, but it is dry reading and, probably through compression, Dr. Chambers' exposition seems here to lose some of its wonted lucidity. The last chapter of the Book, consisting of a biographical dictionary of "Actors," is of immense importance, and happily supersedes the wholly inadequate list of Fleay and Collier's unreliable disquisitions, though it is possible that some of the dates may yet require revision. I will only note that Dr. Chambers has anticipated two conclusions I had reached independently: one that Nathan Field, the actor, was the younger brother of Nathaniel Field, the printer (whom Collier unreasonably murdered in infancy), as well as of the Bishop of Llandaff; the other that there is no sufficient ground for supposing two Robert Wilsons.

The Fourth Book treats of "The Play-Houses," and Chapter XVI. on "The Public Theatres" includes a most useful Introduction on the theatres in general and a summary of the very unsatisfactory evidence afforded by the maps and pictures of contemporary date. The public houses dealt with are sixteen in number, the private (in Chapter XVII.) two; but though the author doubtless has good reasons for classing the abortive Porter's Hall theatre in the Blackfriars among the former, they are not very apparent to the reader. Among public houses are also classed five inns. The more important theatres for the period are five, the Theatre, Curtain, Rose, Globe, and Fortune, and among these interest centres in the Globe both on account of its associations and of the curious difficulties that surround the question of its site. This may now be taken as

settled,* but Dr. Chambers altered his opinion in the course of investigation, and his conversion to the Anchor Brewery view is appended as an afterthought. The whole controversy is of great interest as showing the tricks that the most authentic direct evidence may play, for the site south of Maiden Lane involves the assumption that when the lease of the property was drawn up it was described from a plan which was accidentally turned the wrong way round, so that north and south were reversed! No wonder that Dr. Chambers, with his caution, was rather contemptuous of the suggestion when first advanced. "I daresay that such things do sometimes happen in conveyancer's [*sic*] offices, but it is hardly legitimate to call them in aid as a canon of interpretation." I suppose he has come to recognise that the legitimacy must depend on the temptation, since he now surrenders the point rather than make nonsense of the other evidence. It speaks well for his openmindedness that he bowed to conviction, and for his frankness—perhaps a trifle sardonic—that he left his original argument as it stood.

Maybe the Swan comes next in interest, on account of the drawing and description of it by a Dutch visitor about 1596. There are more variants among the published reproductions of this sketch than Dr. Chambers seems aware, and I should have been glad of an explicit statement that his own block was made direct from the original. By the way, his note as to the position of the drawing in the text is misleading, and I do not feel as certain as he is that it depicts women in the audience. There remain the almost unknown theatre at Newington Butts, the reconstructed baiting-ring known as the Hope, fittingly opened in 1614 with Jonson's malodorous *Bartholomew Fair*, the Boar's Head, which Dr. Chambers thinks may have been between Aldgate and Whitechapel, and the Red Bull in Clerkenwell. Of these I have only to note that one "Browne of the Boares head," mentioned by Mrs. Alleyn, though apparently an actor, was very likely a tenant in Henslowe's property of that name rather than connected with the theatre; and that when Dekker writes: "The pide *Bul* heere keeps a tossing and a roaring, when the *Red Bull* dares not stir," he is alluding not only to Paris Garden, but to the book-trade, the Pied Bull being the sign of the publisher for whom he was writing his tract. The theatres technically known as "Private Houses," are two only, the important

* In spite of the recent arguments in Mr. George Hubbard's monograph *On the Site of the Globe Playhouse*, Cambridge, 1923.

Blackfriars, of which there were two editions so to speak, and the little-known Whitefriars. Their distinctive feature was, of course, that they were roofed: it is perhaps a little misleading to add that they "were occupied by boys," though it is generally true.

An interesting chapter (XVIII.) on "The Structure and Conduct of the Theatres" is followed by three more treating the important and difficult question of "Staging." These, which fill 150 pages, are among the ablest and most valuable in the whole work, but present space forbids my touching on a subject on which I could only comment at length.

I pass to the Fifth and last Book entitled "Plays and Playwrights," but in the first chapter (XXII.), "The Printing of Plays," I find myself treading on somewhat delicate ground. The author explains that it has been included out of a sense of duty and that he would have been well content to have left the subject with a reference to the researches of Mr. A. W. Pollard. I do not think I shall be thought wanting in respect to the Professor of Bibliography if I say that students have every reason to rejoice that duty prevailed. For Dr. Chambers' chapter contains by far the best account of the organisation of the printing trade in respect both to commercial and official control that has so far appeared; while almost equally valuable are the criticisms of the general historian upon those methods and results of more technical bibliographers that have of late figured so largely in Shakespearian criticism. As I may not be free from prejudice in this matter, I will content myself with expressing a merely personal belief that Mr. Pollard's conclusions rest on somewhat securer foundations than Dr. Chambers is inclined to allow.

Linked to this chapter is an equally admirable appendix (L.) summarising the bibliographical information respecting all plays entered or not entered in the Stationers' Register. There is, however, one point on which a word of warning should be added. In the column headed "Publisher" it will be observed that to some names the symbol "(s)" is added, and Dr. Chambers explains that this means "not that a play is printed 'for' a stationer, but that it is 'to be sold by' a stationer; it is not quite clear how far the two formulae are equivalent." The answer is no-far. When a play is only "to be sold by" a stationer, then the printer and not the bookseller must be regarded as the publisher, and will be found to own the copyright. There are, I am aware, apparent exceptions,

but they can, I believe, all be explained within the limits of the general rule. Dr. Chambers' disregard of transfers obscures this important point. And similarly, when a play is printed "for" a stationer, it is he and not the printer who is the responsible party. Dr. Chambers does not appear to have grasped this, nor am I sure that he has quite accurately apprehended the nature of registration. At least, since Roberts neither printed nor published the 1603 *Hamlet*, I can attach no meaning to the statement that "it must have been covered by his entry of 1602."

Chapter XXIII., which fills well over 300 pages, is a biobibliographical dictionary of "Playwrights," while the final Chapter XXIV. treats in a similar manner the "Anonymous Work." Needless to say, they are both of the very first importance. Dr. Chambers disclaims "minute bibliographical erudition," but he has assimilated the facts with his habitual thoroughness and presents them in a workmanlike form. The difficulty of ensuring that such a mass of information shall be uniformly up to date and accurate is formidable, and the general success remarkable; if there are occasional lapses they are, so far as I can judge, neither frequent nor important. As points archaeologically interesting I may observe that the anonymous issue of Marston's Works, 1633, is the later—cancels were supplied throughout with a view to removing all trace of authorship. Also Dr. Chambers treats the issue of Day's *Isle of Gulls*, 1606, with a publisher's name as the later—wrongly I think—with the result that the publisher does not figure in Appendix L., and the publication has an anomalous appearance. The title of one play of which a "plot" is extant is given as "The First parte of Tamar Cham." It is "Tamar Cam" in Steevens' transcript, a spelling supported by Henslowe's "tamber came": this error persists throughout these volumes. Also I must protest against being made responsible for the statement that the third quarto of *Every Man out of his Humour* was printed from the first. Dr. Chambers, by the way, does not accept Munday's authorship of the fragmentary *Camp-Bell* pageant, but I understand from Miss St. Clare Byrne, our chief Munday authority, that the published records of the Ironmongers' Company clearly show it to be his.

A question variously touched on is the date at which different writers began the year. They certainly differ in their record of performances, and a general discussion of the question would have

been welcome. But printing is another story. Dr. Chambers thinks that the Shrove Sunday mentioned in the title of the 1610 *Mucedorus* "might be either 18 February 1610 or 3 February 1611." But can he point to a single popular publication of the time which uses any other than what he terms the Circumcision style—perhaps better called the Pagan?

The four Indexes of Plays, Persons, Places, and Subjects are admirably workmanlike, though readers might have been grateful for the inclusion of some matters that receive only passing mention, say the Lord Warden's men of 1543 (i. 274) and the Sion College manuscript of Shirley's *Sisters* (iii. 193). In the index of plays, titles, we are told, are shortened by the omission of the word "The": why then are ten plays buried under it as a heading?

One looks back after working through Dr. Chambers' pages—happily there are close on two thousand of them—with a profound sense of admiration and gratitude for the brilliant qualities and patient devotion that have gone to the production of the work. It is an achievement of which few men would have been capable and any man might be proud. And I think that we should extend our respectful congratulations to the Oxford University Press for their gallant share in an onerous undertaking.*

I have hinted that caution is perhaps the outstanding feature of Dr. Chambers' work. It is a quality more than usually needed in such a field as the English drama, where there has been in the past so much tainted evidence and so much unsound reasoning. Yet it must be admitted that these volumes pay the price in a certain negative quality. The certainty of history can never be the certainty of mathematics, and perpetual reservation tends to obscure the presentation. We are bound often to rely on circumstantial evidence, the value of which, I think, Dr. Chambers underrates: after all, the whole structure of natural science rests on this basis. The student eager for firm ground to stand on may be forgiven if, under the garb of the respectable civil-servant, he sees at times the "Geist der stets verneint"! To say that the "1608" *Henry V.*, for instance, was "probably" printed in 1619, appears

* Gratitude, however, is a little tempered with disquietude, for I cannot think that the technical production is quite up to the high level the Press has taught us to expect of its work. The inking is often uneven and weak, the types imperfect and with distressing splashes of metal; and I hope the printer will take a hammer and bray small the matrix of a particular italic *C*—page 399 of vol. iv. is an offence to look upon. Also why is the paper full of bits of rubber? and cannot something be done to obviate smudging the print in folding?

to me, since the investigations of Mr. Neidig, mere affectation. It is surely a little misleading to say of five manuscript plays that "some of them may be in the authors' autographs" when one is definitely so regarded by experts, and none of the others are claimed as such. We are told that "Dr. Greg may be right in identifying Sam and Charles" in a "plot" of June 1597 "with the Samuel Rowley and Charles Massey who became members [*sc.* sharers] of the company at a later date"—pretty certainly the next year. At that later date Dr. Chambers himself identifies "Mr. Charles" and "Mr. Sam" in another "plot" with Massey and Rowley *sans phrase*. Elsewhere we read: "One Hunt, whose Christian name is unknown, was with the Admiral's in 1601"—in other words, "Mr. Hunt" appears in the later of these "plots": but "Thomas Hunt" appears in full in the earlier. These identifications are as certain as anything resting on circumstantial evidence can be, and a good deal more so than many things universally accepted on direct evidence. In his fear of committing himself Dr. Chambers merely succeeds in making an already intricate subject unnecessarily bewildering. And this nervousness in the handling of evidence occasionally leads to looseness of statement, as when we are told that the Admiral's men "settled down" at the Rose "in the autumn of 1594"—the evidence placing them there in the middle of June. In the same way, although Dr. Chambers is of course aware of Henslowe's untrustworthiness, he commonly accepts his dates sooner than risk emendation. For instance, he tells us that the Chamberlain's men played at Newington "from the 3rd to the 13th of" June, 1594, though it is almost certain that the correct dates are the 5th and 15th. But, of course, I gladly admit that over-caution, though irritating at times, is a fault on the right side.

And having had the temerity to hint at a fault, I had better be quite frank in such criticisms as I have to make. I have only one serious complaint: it is that in a difficult subject the reader does not receive the amount of material assistance which he has a right to expect. The work is to a great extent one of reference, and reference has not been made easy. One may be familiar with the difficulties of cross-reference and yet feel that to be referred for some small fact to Chapter So-and-So, which may run to fifty pages or more, is not fair. And the number So-and-So is not even given in the headline. It should have been, and so should the names of the companies and theatres in Chapters XII., XIII., XVI., and

XVII. But the capital offence is in the lists of Actors and Playwrights (Chapters XV. and XXIII.), particularly the latter, where the waste of time involved in turning over the leaves in search of a particular author is a constant source of irritation. It is a real misfortune that this invaluable book should be rendered unnecessarily difficult of use by the lack of a little editorial imagination. For this failure I think the Press must share the blame, but taken in conjunction with some signs of hasty revision, to which I shall allude in a moment, and a rather heavy sprinkling of misprints, it cannot but raise a suspicion that the relief of getting so considerable a work off his hands may have betrayed the author into blemishing the labours of twenty years by an undue anxiety to celebrate the tercentenary of the Shakespeare Folio.

The misprints do not, of course, seriously matter, though they are occasionally a little disconcerting. Even on Dr. Chambers' authority I hesitate to believe that one Thomas Vaughan kept the King's Jewels for well over a century and was then only removed from office by the favourite method of the Queen of Hearts (i. 57); that the Jonson Folio really appeared ten years before the date on the title (ii. 203); that legend was already crystallising round the Fat Knight in the middle of the sixteenth century (ii. 443); that the scene of *Romeo and Juliet* is laid mostly at Venice (iii. 123); that Dyce was editing Beaumont and Fletcher at the age of fourteen (iii. 232); or Malone visiting the Audit Office in 1591 (iv. 137); and I cannot help suspecting that when Dr. Chambers says that a certain society issues "text-facsimile reprints" (iii. 206) he means "type-facsimile."

But there are also a number of misstatements which a more thorough revision would no doubt have removed. I would say that I do not think I have found a single error which vitiates Dr. Chambers' own argument or is of very serious consequence in itself, and unless my reading has been a good deal more perfunctory than I imagine, I am inclined to think this a pretty high compliment. But what has not mislead Dr. Chambers may mislead others in a work which students will consult with implicit confidence for generations to come, and I feel bound to enter a warning that if they rely on the present volumes to the exclusion of the original authorities they will be at times—perhaps deservedly—deceived. Space forbids my giving more than a few examples in different categories, but I will mention what seem to me the more serious

slips I have noticed. They occur mainly where Dr. Chambers is summarising technical evidence in a formal manner. For instance, in his list of Actors we find: "DARLOWE. Admiral's, >1590"; "LEE, ROBERT. Admiral's (?), >1591"; "'SAM.' Admiral's, >1591." In each case the evidence is identical and is used again to assign Richard Burbage to "Admiral's c. 1590." The inconsistencies are small but quite unnecessary. Both Anthony and Humphrey Jeffes are made to begin their careers thus: "Chamberlain's (?), 1597; Pembroke's, 1597." But that the "brothers" Jeffes (as Dr. Chambers rather rashly calls them—unless he is keeping evidence up his sleeve) came to the Admiral's from Pembroke's is in fact conjecture, and the evidence by which it is supported on p. 156 is surely an old Fleay-Greg fallacy practically refuted on p. 200. That Humphrey was at some date with the Chamberlain's there is evidence of a sort, but this evidence seems to be used elsewhere to assign John Sincler to "Pembroke's (?), 1592-3." Take again: "HUNT (HONTE), THOMAS. Admiral's, 1599, 1602." The equation Hunt=Honte implies a possible connexion with the Admiral's as early as 1596; he was certainly with them about June 1597, and also, as stated, in 1599. His name appears in an Admiral's document which, on Dr. Chambers' own showing (s.v. R. Alleyn), cannot be later than November 1601, and is absent from a similar document of 1602. So, again, with the records of the Stationers' Register in Appendix L. In 1594 a group of five plays was entered to Islip, whose name was cancelled in favour of E. White: Dr. Chambers assigns four to Islip and one to White!

In the catalogue of Playwrights the trouble is mainly the less serious one of not being revised up to date. The first issue of Greene's *Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, which accounts for the Harveys' animosity, came up for sale in 1919; the passage in question (afterwards suppressed) was facsimiled in the catalogue, and has been printed since. Churton Collins, by the way, is rebuked for holding, as "inconsistent with the biographical indications of the pamphlets," the theory "that Greene's play-writing did not begin much before" 1591; but elsewhere (i. 377) we are told that "It is doubtful whether Greene was writing for the stage at all before about 1590." The first edition of *Edward IV.*, 1599, is not recorded, though it was sold in 1921 and a facsimile published in 1922. *John a Kent* has not been "in the possession of Lord Mostyn" since 1919 (it is now in California), and although one leaf

is defective there is no reason to suppose that two or three are missing. It is true that the date 1596 at the end "has been misread '1595'"—and Dr. Chambers does so himself elsewhere (ii. 144)—but it is misleading to say that the manuscript is "dated" either year without explaining that there is no reason to suppose that the date refers to the writing. I may add that the "plot" of *Frederick and Basilea* was reproduced in the *Book of Homage to Shakespeare*, to which Dr. Chambers contributed, and that the *Robin Hood May Games* were printed in the Collections of a society of which he is the honoured President. Something seems to have gone wrong with his notes of the collected editions of Massinger. Coxeter's (1759) was re-issued with additional matter in 1761; Gifford's (1805) was reprinted with additions in 1813, and this remains the standard; all these are in four volumes. Cunningham's, in 1871, was in one volume, not three; that in three volumes was Murray's "family" edition (1830-1).

But some discrepancies and oversights occur throughout, as could, indeed, hardly be avoided. The identification of "Ro. Go." in the "plot" of the *Seven Deadly Sins* with Robert Gough is classed as "rather hazardous" (ii. 125), as "little more than conjecture" (ii. 199), or as "probable" (ii. 216, 319), according to the mood of the moment. The Globe is stated to have been "No doubt . . . round inside" (ii. 434), but is elsewhere (iii. 85) shown as octagonal. The corrections in *Barnevelt* are Buck's, not Herbert's—at least they are signed "G. B." (i. 321). The actors who appear in *Sir Thomas More* are the Cardinal's, not the King's men (ii. 81), though it is true that mention is made of "Mason among the King's players." The "plot" of *The Dead Man's Fortune* is not now at Dulwich if it ever was (ii. 136); "Proctor" in that of *Troilus and Cressida* is evidently a character, not an actor (ii. 158), and so is "Pisano" in that of *Alcazar* (ii. 176), as Dr. Chambers may see by referring to the quarto. Is it true that incriminating papers were found at Nashe's lodgings (i. 298)? or certain that the Chamberlain's company was not in being on 13 May 1594 (ii. 198)? Commenting on a statement by Chalmers, Dr. Chambers remarks quite correctly (ii. 429) that "a line drawn south from the west of Queenhithe would pass west of any possible site for the Globe," but I think he has forgotten to allow for magnetic variation: Chalmers expressly mentions compass bearings! Lastly, I hope that readers will remember that when they are told, all too often, that "Dr. Greg

thinks " some absurdity or other, the reference is usually to the work of a novice, often dating nearly twenty years back, and sometimes manifestly at variance with more recent information even if not specifically withdrawn.

But I would not part from Dr. Chambers on a note of complaint. His volumes are a pleasure to read and a joy to use (when cross-reference is not needed !), and they place the subject of the Elizabethan Stage upon an entirely new footing. We must one and all take off our hats to the wealth of his knowledge and his manner of imparting it.

W. W. GREG.

Mediaeval England : A New Edition of Barnard's "Companion to English History." Edited by H. W. C. DAVIS. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1924. Pp. xxi. + 632. 21s. net.

THE need of an illustrated handbook to society and life in the English Middle Age is felt by the student of literature as keenly as by the professed historian. This new and reorganised edition of Dr. Barnard's useful volume will be hailed with considerable pleasure by both. It is a beautifully produced work. A good deal of the illustration, particularly the architectural diagrams in the first chapter, it would be hard to better ; most of the new work, on ecclesiastical building and organisation, on mediæval handwriting and printing, on coinage, is of manifest distinction ; and the price for such good things is reasonable. As a selection, confessedly not as a synthesis, of English mediæval antiquities the book will be abundantly helpful.

Even granted that the book is a companion, it might have been advisable, in view of the new material added, to arrange the order of the chapters rather differently from that in which they now stand. After chapters on Ecclesiastical and Domestic Architecture (I. and II.), War (Military Architecture and the Art of War, III.), Civil and Military Costume (IV. and V.), Heraldry (VI.), and Shipping (VII.), come two on Town Life (VIII.) and Country Life (IX.) by the late Miss Toulmin Smith and the late Mr. George Townsend Warner respectively ; then follow long subdivided chapters on the Monks, the Friars, and the Secular Clergy (X.), and on Learning and Education (XI.),

two (XII. and XIII.) upon Art and Coinage, and finally a chapter (XIV.) on Trade and Commerce by the late Mr. Leadam. From an historical standpoint would it not have been advisable to group together at the beginning the chapters on organisation, social, economic, religious (Nos. VIII., IX., XIV., X.), as supplying the basis upon which the study of *realien* could rise? We should then be able to follow with greater ease the development of the architecture of which Mr. Lamborn and Mr. Gotch have written. One does not see why Shipping should follow Heraldry; the mediæval navy being what it was, it seems more natural that the account of shipbuilding and the vessels used for war should follow the chapter on Trade. Question of order apart, it cannot be said that Chapters VII., VIII., IX., and XIV. have been brought wholly up to date. Chancery Enrolments of the thirteenth century, Exchequer Accounts (K.R. "Army, Navy, and Ordnance") of the fourteenth and fifteenth, have let in a great deal of information not utilised in the chapter on Shipping. The late Miss Toulmin Smith's chapter remains stronger on the subject of Gilds and Crafts than on Town Government. Dr. James Tait's *Study of Municipal History in England* (*Proc. Brit. Acad.*, 1922, which might have found a mention in § 2 of the "Books for Reference") has shown that such conclusions as that on p. 288, where the author adhered rather too strongly to the "garrison" theory of the burh, or on p. 290, where she inclined to Miss Bateson's views on the Bretollian origin of a number of boroughs, need a little re-orientation. In this last connection Dr. Hemmeon's important work, *Burgage Tenure in Mediæval England*, should have found a place even in a very summary and selective bibliography. In Chapter IX., § 3, on "Feudal Tenures," we are given the ancient view of the "scattering" of estates at the Conquest; the doubtful statement that the "apparent restlessness" of the great barons and of the court (at what particular epoch?) is explained by the fact that both they and the king held manors in many different counties, and owing to the poverty of these had perpetually to be travelling from one to the other (p. 327); the remark (p. 328) that "in an age when fighting was thought to be the only profession for gentlemen (was this in the twelfth, the thirteenth, or the fourteenth century?), tenure by knight service was naturally reckoned more dignified and more aristocratic than tenure by free socage"—which seems to neglect the fact that, in the thirteenth century at any rate, many holders of knights'

fees or fractions of knights' fees were only too glad to hold land in the more peaceful form of tenure wherever they could, and implies a rigidity in tenurial distinctions which did not exist; and the (now) surprising view that "by the time of the Black Death (1348) it appears that commutation of service had become fairly common" (p. 326), the footnote to which seems to neglect the criticism effectively brought against Mr. T. W. Page's statistics in his *End of Villeinage in England*, and the work of economic scholars like Miss Levett. Such generalisations as those above are applicable only to certain districts, not to the country as a whole. To Chapter XIV. some account of the banking activities of the Temple in the thirteenth century and a fuller explanation of the system of loans, recovery, and book-keeping of the Sienese and Florentine merchants in the fourteenth, might have been added, and a little discussion of current negotiable instruments in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries would have been a useful prelude to the section on commerce. The recent work of scholars has shown that the credit system was far more developed in this period than was suspected at the time when Mr. Leadam wrote.

Of the new work, Mr. Lamborn's chapter is both interesting and useful, especially for its account of the Parish Church. He is a little too concerned with purely structural, not enough with liturgical, factors in the development of constructional form; and his account of monastic buildings, somewhat slight and perfunctory, does not notice the differences between the Benedictine and Cistercian ground plans, or the peculiar characteristics of their respective styles, and is rather misleading on the subject of monastic cooking. It is a pity that Fig. 6 (tower of St. Michael's, Oxford) is a photograph of a restoration which surely does not preserve the original Saxon window detail. The sections on Monasticism by Miss Rose Graham and on the Mendicant Orders by Mr. Little it would be impertinent to commend. The latter in particular is a model of *vulgarisation*, the best summary account of the subject yet written. Within the space allotted to them, Mr. Madan and Mr. Gibson have written useful contributions on Handwriting and Early Printed Books. On the topic of thirteenth-century hand something in between the slightly archaic, rather Johannine-looking charter of 1220 (Fig. 292), and the very Edwardian-looking grant to Merton College (Fig. 293, not a first-class negative) might have been chosen to illustrate mid-thirteenth-century chancery hand, and a section on writing materials, pens,

skins, etc., would not have been out of place. On the subject of early book production the licences granted by Henry VIII. *ad imprimendum solum* form an interesting little chapter on the connection between the Court and the Printing Press which it would have been pleasant to see noticed here. Mr. Brooke's remarks on coinage, one of the best pieces of work in the book, combine history with archæology in the happiest blending. Of the re-written articles Mr. Rushforth's was the most difficult to do adequately, and it has been done with great skill. One cannot too much admire his choice of illustrations. Dr. Barnard's admirable chapter on Heraldry needs no commendation; but I feel a little sorry that the only treatment of the seal in mediæval England should be a purely heraldic or artistic one. Its administrative importance is so great that a section on it might have been fitted in somewhere.

Omissions, of course, there are in plenty. Music (alas!), the craft of the leather worker and the goldsmith, the construction, apart from the upkeep, of public works like bridges, dykes, etc., agricultural implements, tools in general, and a number more. But it would be ungenerous to grumble; one can only be grateful to Professor Davis and the Clarendon Press for what they have given us here.

E. F. JACOB.

Illustrations to the Life of St. Alban in Trin. Coll. Dublin MS. E. i. 40. Reproduced in Collotype Facsimile by the care of W. R. L. LOWE and E. F. JACOB, with a Description of the Illustrations by M. R. JAMES. Oxford Univ. Press: 1924. 42s.

MANUSCRIPT decoration is not the only important branch of English mediæval art, but it is, as must have been felt by all who visited the little exhibition of English Primitives last winter, the only branch, apart from architecture, of which there remain to us adequate materials for study. And for this reason the exhibition, excellently though the MSS. shown were chosen, was disappointing, because you cannot study MSS. in a glass case, where you may not turn over the leaves. And of the artists in this field whose work survives and may in some degree be identified, Matthew Paris is, we may say, the only one whose name can at all be called a household word. Nor

is this altogether unjust. Lindisfarne, Winchester, Canterbury, Peterborough, some East Anglian centre or centres, may at various times have had greater artists. Eadfrith and Godeman (perhaps), de Brailes and Siferwas were great illuminators, but we have not the same right to call them founders of schools that we have in the case of the St. Alban historian, nor have we the same knowledge of their personality. It is therefore surprising and not too creditable that we wait so long for a corpus of the drawings of the Matthew Paris school, though Dr. James's Roxburghe volume *La Estoire de Seint Ædward le Rei* was a considerable instalment, and the fifty-four picture pages now before us are a second and even more important contribution. We must use the word "school," for attribution to Matthew's own hand still needs caution, though Dr. James seems now more ready to credit Matthew with all the pictures in the Dublin Alban than he was when he wrote the St. Edward introduction and committed himself only as to a picture of the Virgin and Child. But it is "school" in the closest sense that we must use of this and the sister volumes, the St. Edward at Cambridge, and the St. Thomas, of which a fragment only survives in Belgium. Would that some miraculous "invention" would restore to us the lost St. Edmund, which Walsingham (or another) adds to the list. All four were certainly executed under Matthew's direction, and the three (Alban, Thomas, Edward) are claimed by Paris himself (on the Dublin flyleaf) as his own work ("protraxi"), and what remains of them must all form part of the collection of Matthew's work, even if not all his unaided achievement. To these must be added the first six drawings in the Lives of the Offas with certain other drawings in Cotton MS., Nero D.I., the drawings in the Historia Maior at Corpus, some of those in the lesser history, Royal MS. 14 C. vii., and doubtless also, since Dr. Lindblom pointed it out, five added drawings in the Westminster Psalter, Royal 2 A. xxii. Reproductions of some of the pictures in each of these exist, but scattered and not all good, and they have not been commented on as Dr. James could do it. Meanwhile the subscribers to this portfolio have nothing left to wish for in the quality of the collotypes or the learning and judgment of the descriptions. They owe much to Messrs. Lowe and Jacob for a very cheap book, as well as to Dr. James for a very scholarly one.

J. P. GILSON.

Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century. Edited by CARLETON BROWN. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1924. Pp. xxiii. + 358. 10s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR CARLETON BROWN'S purpose, in this volume and the two in which he promises to deal similarly with the XIIIth and XVth century lyrics, is to represent, by a series of specimens arranged as far as possible in chronological order, the development of the religious lyric during the three centuries. In the present volume he illustrates the XIVth century with 135 poems, of which a fair number are printed for the first time, many given from better texts than those previously known, and all save one collated with the MSS. The apparatus criticus is comprehensive but concise: he postpones "a full Introduction to the fourteenth-century material until it can be discussed in connexion with the lyrics which preceded and followed." While including half a dozen lyrics from MS. Harley 2253, the source of the well-known "Alysoun," he hints that most of the religious lyrics in this MS. belong rather to the XIIIth century.

The largest group presented in this volume consists of twenty-six "refrain" poems from the Vernon MS. (Bodleian 3938), but most of these have been printed before. A new contribution is comprised in twenty-two lyrics from John Grimestone's commonplace book (Advocates MS. 18. 7. 21), hitherto unprinted, though variants from other MSS. of some of the lyrics are known. It may be noted that Professor Carleton Brown does not infer from the statement "Iohannis de Grimstone . . . scripsit istum librum" that John Grimestone was the author of the lyrics. But in the case of the fourteen hymns by Friar William Herebert, from Phillipps MS. 8336, some of which have previously appeared only in *Reliquiæ Antiquæ* (1841-3), there is, besides a direct statement that the Friar not only "in manu sua scripsit," but also "transtulit [istos hymnos] in Anglicum," an interesting confirmation thereof, in the shape of a pencil draft-translation of one hymn in Herebert's handwriting on the margin of the Anglo-Norman original—the French texts being part of the same MS.

The fact that these lyrics, as well as many others in the volume, bear witness to the tendency of fourteenth-century preachers to introduce vernacular verse into their sermons, suggests that the

book contains much material for linguistic study. From the purely literary point of view, it does not introduce much new matter of striking merit. There is, of course, the ever fresh charm and characteristic naïveté of detached phrases: "þe coluere of noe" for the dove sent forth from the Ark; "a Sory beuerech" for the bitter cup of Gethsemane; "a weping dale" for "this vale of tears." No. 49, "All Other Love is like the Moon," from a MS. at Eton hitherto unprinted, has an attractive simplicity; but No. 69, from Grimestone's book, disappoints the fancy stirred by its refrain:

Lueli ter of loueli eyze, qui dostu me so wo?
Sorful ter of sorful eyze, þu brekst myn herte a-to.

No. 5, from a New College, Oxford, MS., might find a corner in anthologies:

Louerd, þu clepedest me
an ich nagt ne ansuarede þe
Bute wordes scloe and sclepie:
"þole yet! þole a litel!"
Bute "yiet" and "yiet" was endelis,
and "þole a litel" a long wey is.

There is, moreover, a wealth of material for students of literary morphology, and Professor Carleton Brown's notes are constantly stimulating. His general introduction, when it comes, will no doubt comment amongst other things on the elaborate structures of the stanzaic forms, which, in this happy spring-tide of our language, the great freedom of riming allowed to the poets. No. 81 corresponds in rhythm and rime-scheme (apart from the first line) to *The Nutbrown Maid*. No. 83 shows very curious rhythmic evolutions. In the Vernon series, several poems of similar structure, with a rime-scheme *ab ab ab ab bc bc*, might have been presented in similar style; but Nos. 101 and 106 are printed with indentations, No. 103 flush. Nos. 51-54, from Harleian MS. 2316, are there written, the editor notes, "as prose": and though this is not without parallel, one is again prompted to wonder why.

In his note on No. 67, the earliest version of the *Dialogue between Jesus and the B.V. at the Cross*, Professor Carleton Brown makes a very suggestive comment in referring to the later versions: "A comparison of these several versions affords an interesting opportunity to observe the tendencies in lyrical development." How did the variations arise? Such a lyric cannot be held to be as "fatherless" as a popular ballad; but the occurrence of versions in such

"minstrels' song-books" as were probably MSS. like Sloane 2593 and Bodleian Eng. poet. e. 1 (Thomas Wright's), suggests that poems of this kind were subject to the accidents of oral dissemination in much the same manner as popular ballads and songs. It was interesting to discover another version of this *Dialogue*, perhaps the first in print, in the fragmentary *Christmas carolles*, printed by Richard Kele, which was sold from the Britwell library at Sotheby's, on March 31, 1924 :

Gaudeamus synge we in hoc sacro tempore
Puer nobis natus est ex Maria uirgine.
Mary moder come and se
Thy sone is nayled on a tre, etc.

Indeed, a detritus from this *Dialogue* and those between the B.V. and her Child, as well as from variants of the "Lullay" poems, seems to linger in popular carols : e.g. in *The Seven Virgins*, a medley of familiar phrases survives :

"O peace, mother, O peace, mother,
Your weeping doth me grieve ;
I must suffer this," he said,
"For Adam and for Eve."

• • •
"O mother, take you John Evangelist
All for to be your son," etc.

F. SIDGWICK.

Elizabethans. By A. H. BULLEN. London : Chapman & Hall, Ltd. 1924. Pp. xi. + 226. 10s. 6d. net.

THIS collection of ten lectures and essays by the late A. H. Bullen deserves a hearty welcome on two grounds, both for the readable accounts which it gives of a number of Elizabethan worthies and as a document belonging to and exemplifying an age of English scholarship which is passing, if not already past. When Bullen began his work on Elizabethan literature the great period of discovery was indeed over. In the drama, in the major kinds of poetry, there was little more to be brought to light, no great new planet would swim again into any watcher's ken, nothing was likely seriously to disturb the views then held as to the degree of honour due to the poets and playwrights of the age, nor indeed was Bullen—though

he never praised for fashion's sake alone—one to challenge lightly a received opinion. But he was fortunate in finding one unworked field, that of the song-books, which seem to have been overlooked by previous literary historians as the affair of the musicians. From these song-books he unearthed a wealth of lyric verse which has been a permanent addition to our literature.

Gifted with an intense appreciation of beauty—especially of that beauty of the English countryside, of old villages and the river meadows in spring, and of all the literature in which such beauty finds expression, and with a memory which seemed to let slip nothing that he had ever rejoiced to find, he loved the literature of the Elizabethan age and all that in any way echoed it, and out of his love for it he studied it and made it his own. But the treatment of that literature as a series of problems was hateful to him, and for the intellectual pleasure that can be derived from research he cared, I think, but little, unless he could see clearly that that research added to the glory of those old poets whom he loved. Indeed he was frankly scared of the minuteness of "German" editorial methods, for which he had a curious mixture of loathing and respect, and even came to feel that much of his own editorial work was out of date—a fear which unluckily caused the abandonment of the revised edition of his "Marlowe" after the first volume was all in type and had received its final corrections. The truth is, of course, that there is room for several ways of editing any book which is worth editing at all, and that Bullen's way was for many readers, perhaps for the majority, the best.

The "serious" student will perhaps find that, with one or two exceptions, these lectures contain little that is altogether new to him, but it will do him much good to read them. Indeed I would especially commend them to all such students as the work of a man who never forgot that one of the objects of literature is to give pleasure, and as an admirable corrective to the mental attitude which may be induced by too exclusive absorption in the more painful kinds of research.

Of the ten papers in the volume perhaps those on Nicholas Breton, Thomas Dekker, and William Bullein will prove most attractive, the two first because of the evident sympathy with which they are written, the last on account of the novelty of the matter, for it deals with one who is practically unknown to most literary students. The essay on Drayton also is an excellent piece of work,

though here, as in the case of Daniel and Chapman, one may feel that the lengthy quotations, indispensable as they were for the purpose of the original lectures, have hardly left sufficient space for an all-round consideration of the author. But Bullen's mind was always somewhat that of the anthologist. He loved, I think, to choose a writer's best and to concentrate his attention on that, rather than to judge him by his work as a whole. This may at times have caused a certain bias in his criticisms; it certainly lent them enthusiasm and the power of imparting that enthusiasm to others.

And yet with all this there was often a marked restraint in Bullen's judgments. He was a scholar of the older sort, one who could read Latin and Greek with sufficient ease to enjoy them, and there was a certain tinge of classical severity in his attitude towards Elizabethan literature. He had an instinctive dislike of anything "overdone," of "fine writing" of any kind, and much as he loved the Elizabethans I do not think he was ever completely at ease about their casual and careless exuberance. It is this tinge of severity, I think, which accounts for such a characterisation as that of Daniel's *Defence of Rhyme* as "an admirable critical treatise, tasteful, judicious and convincing." It may be all this, but surely the most remarkable thing about it is the beauty of its prose—to those at least of us who, trained rather in the mediæval than the classical tradition, are less intolerant of the purple patch. But a little severity is good where there has been so much loose-lipped praise, and Bullen himself could be a true Elizabethan at times, as when at the close of his introduction to Marston, he dragged in by the ears the great peroration of Donne's most famous sermon, one of the longest as it is one of the most splendid sentences of English, with no more than the shameless excuse that Marston's sermons had perished, whereas Donne's had not—that and the true reason that he knew and delighted in it and would have others know it too!

This indeed was at the heart of all Bullen's work, a genuine love of the best in literature and a keen desire that all should share the pleasure that he himself had found in it. And can there be any better motive for a scholar's work than this?

R. B. MCKERROW.

Reproduction of some of the Original Proof-sheets of
Boswell's "Life of Johnson." Printed by R. B. Adam
for his Friends. Buffalo, N.Y. 1923.

THE latest is by no means the least of the privately printed books with which Mr. Adam is accustomed to enrich his friends and to further scholarship. It has long been known that among the treasures of his great collection are the proofs of a large part of the first volume of the first edition of the *Life*, and a complete set of the revises of both volumes. These were seen by Birkbeck Hill, who wrote an article on them in the *Johnson Club Papers*. Mr. Adam has now reproduced in full-size facsimile some seventy pages of the proofs, with Boswell's corrections and other marginalia. They are of interest as showing Boswell's diligence in attention to detail. Nothing was too small to be weighed in what he once called his "neat little scales." In one place, where a Latin tag had been printed as part of two lines, he begs the printer to "put *respicere*, etc., in one line if it can be done easily." He alters "clean-shirt day" from roman type to "Italicks."

Boswell made many corrections, and was nervous lest they should not be correctly executed. There are numerous directions to the printer, such as: "For Press, when carefully read and corrected by Mr. Selfe"; or afterthoughts, such as that which erased the instruction just quoted, and substituted: "As there are many alterations in this sheet, send a Revise, and it shall be returned directly." Boswell was not prepared to tolerate serious errors. "Pray be very attentive, that I may have no cancels and few errata." (There *were* cancels; but some of them at least were due to causes more interesting than printers' errors.)

By the way, we get pleasant glimpses of Boswell bustling about London, full of his "magnum opus." "I shall see this at the printing-house to-morrow morning before it is thrown off. Tuesday." "Let me have another *Revise* sent to Sir Joshua Reynolds's in Liecester Square, where I dine, and it shall be returned *instantly*."

Boswell's is not the only hand. Before the well-known (undated) letters to Cave, the first of which begins, "I believe I am going to write a long letter," Boswell has added in the margin:

Their contents show that they were written about this time, and that he was now engaged in preparing an historical account of the British Parliament.

But this was occasioned by another marginal note :

Something sh^d be said introductory to this, to show what it is about. This note is not in Boswell's hand ; there is little doubt that it is in Malone's. And it may have been Malone who supplied an interesting note on the edition of the *Ramblers*, produced, in penny numbers, by Elphinston at Edinburgh :

They were composed from manuscript which Johnson had with the proof.

This must mean that when Johnson's manuscript came back from the London printer he sent it to Edinburgh. The procedure would account for verbal differences which appear in the two editions. If, on the other hand, the Edinburgh edition was set up from manuscript, it is surprisingly correct, and the differences, in some numbers at least, surprisingly few, if we remember the haste with which Johnson scribbled and the freedom with which he corrected. It is perhaps more likely that, as a rule, he sent Elphinston a corrected proof, and sometimes made further corrections in the proof which he sent to press in London.

Elsewhere we find evidence of other helpers. Against the paragraph which relates, on the authority of Mrs. Desmoulins, that Mrs. Johnson "indulged herself in country air and nice living, at an unsuitable expence" at Hampstead, while her husband was "drudging in the smoke of London," Boswell has written :

This Remains till an answer comes from Dr. Warton.

The question of the authorship of certain numbers of the *Adventurer* seems to have worried Boswell. The original text is blacked out as if by a censor ; but the name of Coleman is legible. In the margin appear Bonnel Thornton, who is erased in his turn, and Bathurst, who survives.

The book is full of such things, small in themselves, yet eloquent of Boswell's indefatigable zeal and the workings of his busy, restless mind. All good Johnsonians will wish to inspect this splendid volume, if they may not all hope to own it. Once more Mr. Adam has deserved their congratulations and grateful thanks.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

Ancient Rome in the English Novel. A Study in English Historical Fiction. RANDOLPH FARIES 2d. Philadelphia: 1923.

THE author of this study is inclined to value the novels with which he deals too highly and to take second- and third-rate work too seriously. The book is useful rather for the fullness of its material than for its criticisms. There is a fairly complete review of the subject, and a bibliography in which we have noticed only one unimportant error. *Marius Flaminius* (p. 137) should be *Marcus Flaminius*; the novel was published in 1792, with a second edition in 1808, and the author was Cornelia Knight, Lady Companion to Princess Charlotte of Wales, and author of *Dinarbas*, the continuation of *Rasselas*. The story is laid in the period 762-769 A.U.C., and is told in a series of letters. It is a curious production, not altogether unhistorical, but with a sentimental atmosphere of the XVIIIth century, and of interest for the genesis of the historical novel.

E. C. B.

Gotik und Ruine in der englischen Dichtung des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts, von DR. REINHARD HAFERKORN. (Leipziger Beiträge z. engl. Philologie, hgg. v. Max Förster, IV.) Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1924. Pp. viii. + 204. 3 M.

THIS is a most careful study of the "Gothic Revival" which bridged the gap between the classical convention of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries and the romanticism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth. The reawakening of interest in the middle ages showed itself on the one hand in a genuine study of native antiquities and archæology, and on the other in a sentimental and dilettante antiquarianism which led in architecture to the development of the sham gothic style of building and to a cult of ruins, real or artificial, for their picturesqueness, and in literature to a conventional use of descriptions of ruined castles, deserted halls and the like, to illustrate moral reflections on the transitoriness of human life. Dr. Haferkorn analyses the use of this *Ruinenmotiv* in the work of all the more important writers of his period. Perhaps his work would have been more useful if it had been a little less elaborated, but it is a mine of information on its somewhat depressing subject, and well deserves the attention of students of eighteenth-century literature and criticism.

R. B. McK.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY EDITH C. BATHO

ANGLIA, Vol. XLVIII., neue Folge XXXVI., March 1924—

Felicia Hemans und die englische Beziehungen zur deutschen Literatur im ersten Drittel des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Werner K. Ruprecht), pp. 1-53.

Continued in June 1924, pp. 169-208.

Deismus und Atheismus in der englischen Renaissance (Friedrich Brie), pp. 54-98.

Concluded in June 1924, pp. 105-68.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. IV., April 1924—

Amor est quedam mentis insania (C. T. Onions), p. 114.

Latin, French and English verses from MS. Douce 139, printed for the first time, illustrating trilingual condition of England in XIIIth century.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, Vol. LVI., April 1924—

The Popularity of Byron (John Murray), pp. 385-91.

Imagined Byrons (Rowland Grey), pp. 392-400.

The Early Writings of Lewis Carroll (His Honour Judge Parry), pp. 455-468.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. VI., April 1924—

Byron, II.: Some characteristics of his Poetry (F. J. Hopman), pp. 49-60.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. LVIII., No. I.—

Chauntecler and Pertelote on Dreams (W. C. Curry), pp. 24-60.

A discussion of Chaucer's classical and mediaeval sources of knowledge of dream-psychology and the philosophy of sleep.

Thomas de Quincey (Helene Richter), pp. 61-85.

Life, Opium Eater, characteristics as writer.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XXXIX., April 1924—

Sources of Heywood's *If You Know not Me, You Know Nobody*, Part I. (R. G. Martin), pp. 220-22.

Foixe rather than Holinshed the main source.

A New Poem by Thomas Chatterton (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 226-29.

Elegy. Oct. 29, printed for first time from Chatterton MS. in Phoenix Collection in Library of Columbia University. Discussion of other poems in MS.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 125

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XXXIX., May 1924—

Chaucer as a Literary Critic (W. H. Wells), pp. 255-68.

Examination of Chaucer's opinions of contemporaries, ancients and himself, as expressed in his poems.

A New Date for George Wilkins's *Three Miseries of Barbary* (G. S. Greene), pp. 285-91.

Internal and bibliographical evidence for 1607.

An Arthurian Parallel (John J. Parry), pp. 307-9.

Welsh folk-lore parallel to Bedevere and Excalibur.

— June 1924—

Thomas Chatterton's *Epistle to the Reverend Mr. Catcott* (G. R. Potter), pp. 336-38.

Chatterton's religious views.

The Apparitions in *Macbeth*, Part I. (A. W. Crawford), pp. 345-50.

Chaucer and Venantius Fortunatus (A. S. Cook), pp. 376-78.

First Song in *The Beggar's Bush* (W. D. Briggs), pp. 379-80.

Versification of passages in Erasmus's Colloquy *Πρωχολογία*.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XIX., April 1924—

Edmond Ironside and *The Love-Sick King* (M. Hope Dodds), pp. 158-68.

Suggested borrowing by Anthony Brewer, author of *Edmond Ironside*, from *The Love-Sick King* (anon.).

Italian and English Pastoral Drama: II. The Source of Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* (V. M. Jeffrey), pp. 176-87.

Diderot et Shaftesbury (René P. Legros), pp. 188-94.

Influence of Shaftesbury on Diderot.

Notes on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (R. J. Menner), pp. 204-8.

Spenser's Knowledge of Plato (A. E. Taylor), pp. 208-10.

Discussion of evidence that Spenser had no first-hand knowledge of Plato.

A Manuscript Poem of Wordsworth (Edith J. Morley), pp. 211-14.

First draft of lines *To the Moon*, 1835.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. XCV., March 1924—

The Ghost in *Hamlet* (W. J. Lawrence), pp. 370-77.

Defence of the objectivity of the ghost, and discrimination between his outward forms in the opening act and the closet scene.

— April 1924—

Richard Jeffries (G. R. Stirling Taylor), pp. 530-40.

Continued in May 1924, pp. 686-96.

I. His Study of Nature. II. His Philosophy of Life.

Byron's Suliote Bodyguard (Commander Lord Teignmouth, R.N.),

pp. 541-54.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, June 1924—

The Novel of To-Day (A. Ryan), pp. 843-51.

The *Morte d'Arthur* (Charles F. Cooksey), pp. 852-59.

Identification of Caractacus and Arthur.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 146, 1924—

April 5—

Notes on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (C. T. Onions), pp. 244-45.

Continued April 19, pp. 285-86.

May 3—

The Mandeville Canon: A Supplement (F. B. Kaye), pp. 317-20.

Disproves certain attributions to Mandeville in Wrenn Library of Univ. of Texas.

May 10—

Thomas Fyde, Apothecary (J. C. Whitebrook), pp. 339-40.

Account of MS., dated 1666, in British Museum, showing influence of Cambridge Neo-Platonists.

May 17—

Lord Byron at Southwell (C. Becher Pigot), p. 358.

Friendship with Pigot family; Byron relics.

May 31—

The Authorship of *A Knack to Know a Knave* (H. Dugdale Sykes), pp. 389-91.

Continued on June 7, pp. 410-12. Conclusion that the play is originally and substantially by Peele, with additions or alterations by another or others.

Sizars and the Woolsack (Constance Russell), p. 400.

Anecdote of Dr. Johnson.

June 7—

"F. S." in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (G. A. Anderson), p. 419.

Suggested explanation of the passage. Additional note by G. C. Moore-Smith on June 28, p. 474.

June 14—

The Mummers' Play (G. E. P. A.), pp. 435-37.

Continued in June 21, pp. 453-55.

Version taken down from Burghclere Mummers in 1920, with additions.

June 21—

Edmund Spenser. Some New Discoveries and the Correction of some Old Errors (W. H. Welply), pp. 445-47.

Biographical matter. Corrections in Vol. 147, July 12, p. 35.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XXXIX., June 1924—

On the Discrimination of Romanticisms (A. O. Lovejoy), pp. 229-53.

Discussion of the confusion of terminology and thought which surrounds "Romanticism."

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 127

The Narrative-Technique of the *Faerie Queene* (J. W. Draper), pp. 310-24.

Conclusion that form of the poem was largely dictated by Italian criticism of the forty preceding years.

Essays Erroneously Attributed to Goldsmith (Caroline F. Tupper), pp. 325-42.

Evidence against Goldsmith's authorship of the seven essays *On the Study of the Belles Lettres*.

William Blake and his Companions from 1818 to 1827 (Harold Bruce), pp. 358-68.

The Term "Communal" (Louise Pound), pp. 440-54.

Arguments against its use in reference to popular or traditional poetry.

The English Ballad in Jamaica: A Note upon the Origin of the Ballad Form (Martha W. Beckwith), pp. 455-83.

Treatment of English ballads by negroes in Jamaica, with examples, and suggestions on development of the ballad.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, 1924. April 3—

Shelley and the Unromantics (W. H. Woollen), p. 208.

Referring to a letter by H. J. C. Grierson (March 27) on Mrs. Campbell's *Shelley and the Unromantics*, and correcting some minor inaccuracies in that book.

The Text of Emily Brontë (Clement Shorter and C. W. Hatfield), p. 208.

History of Brontë MSS. and reply to reviewer of *The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë*.

April 17—

Titus and Vespasian (R. Crompton Rhodes), p. 240.

Relation between this and *Titus Andronicus*. Discussion continued by W. W. Greg (May 1, p. 268), John S. Smart (May 8, p. 286), W. W. Greg (May 15, p. 304), R. Crompton Rhodes (May 22, p. 322), J. M. Robertson (May 29, p. 340), John S. Smart (June 5, p. 356).

April 24—

Don Quichote (R. E. Baker), p. 253.

Question whether title-page issued to 1st vol. of 1st edition of Shelton's translation. Answered by J. F. Newham (May 1, p. 268); further notes by F. S. Ferguson (May 15, p. 304), and by R. E. Baker (June 26, p. 404).

Thomas Kyd (F. S. Boas), p. 253.

Documents concerning charge of writing "atheistical documents."

May 1—

Much Ado about Nothing, v. 1, 16 (R. H. Case), p. 268.

The Case for Branwell Brontë (C. W. Hatfield), p. 268.

Discussion continued by Alice Law (May 8, p. 286, reply to reviewer of *Patrick Branwell Brontë*), C. W. Hatfield (May 15, p. 304), Alice Law (May 22, p. 322; June 5, p. 356).

May 8—

Keats, *The Fall of Hyperion*, i. 97 (A. E. H.), p. 286.

Emendation.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, 1924. May 22—

A Literary Discovery at Eton (Henry Broadbent), p. 322.

Discovery of a copy of 1751 edition of Gray's *Elegy*.

The Confusions of Prosody (Egerton Smith), p. 322.

Reply to reviewer of *The Principles of English Metre* (March 20, p. 171), who replied again on May 29, p. 340.

June 5—

Marvell in Rome (H. M. Margoliouth), p. 356.

Evidence that Marvell travelled as a tutor.

Byron: The Last Journey (P. P. Howe), p. 356.

Correction of a point in *Byron: The Last Journey*.

Shakespeare Allusions (James Tregaskis), p. 356.

Shakespeare Allusions (C. R. Haines), p. 356.

Both letters give XVIIth century allusions.

Love's Labour's Lost (R. F. Rattray), p. 356.

Suggested correction of v. 2, 67, and interpretation of v. 2, 12. Answered by James F. Muirhead, June 12, p. 372.

June 12—

"That is, hot ice, and wondrous strange snow" (Henry Cuninghame),

pp. 371-72.

Discussion of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, v. 1, 59; continued by A. H. F. S. (June 19, p. 388), Henry Cuninghame (June 26, p. 404; B. A. P. van Dam, July 3, p. 420).

The Word "Dais" (Walter Worrall), p. 372.

Discussion of line in *Yet if his majesty our sovereign lord*.

Wordsworth's *Prelude* (C. W. B.), p. 372.

Suggested emendation of Book VII., ll. 159-67.

June 19—

Renaissance Bypaths (Gwendolen Murphy), pp. 387-88.

Points on "characters" and character-writers arising out of Professor Thompson's *Renaissance Bypaths* and its review in T. L. S., June 5, p. 352.

June 26—

"Cæsus's Dream" (S. J. Crawford), p. 404.

Source of Chaucer's *Monk's Tale*, ll. 3937-48.

The First Edition of *Kidnapped* (Leonard Kebler), p. 404.

Bibliographical note.

July 3—

The Royal Blackbird (W. H. Grattan Flood), p. 420.

Evidence that this ballad is Anglo-Irish. Replies by Davidson Cook and H. Halliday Sparling, July 10, p. 436.

Cary's *Early French Poets* (R. W. King), p. 420.

Remarks on recent reprint.

